

The Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 will fill the critical void left by the 1990 law. This bill will provide Medicaid coverage to uninsured women who have been screened and diagnosed with breast cancer through the Center for Disease Control Program.

As Mother's Day approaches, passage of the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000 is a fitting tribute to all our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters.

As a cosponsor of this legislation and a long-time supporter of breast cancer research, I am so delighted to lend my support to this important bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the issue of Social Security, on the issue of total public debt, it has been suggested by Vice President Gore that we start using the surplus coming in from Social Security and borrowing that money to pay down what is called the debt held by the public.

Just for a brief review, we now owe about \$5.7 trillion total debt. That includes what I call the Wall Street debt, the debt held by the public, at about \$3.7 trillion dollars. It includes what we owe Social Security at approximately \$1 trillion and what we owe the other trust fund at approximately \$1.1 trillion.

The suggestion is that if we use the surplus coming in from Social Security and pay down the Wall Street debt, the debt held by the public, then the savings in interest, which represents about 15 percent of our budget now, pretty bad, we should pay down that debt, using all of that savings to apply to the Social Security Trust Fund so it becomes another giant IOU of a future promise that somehow the Federal Government will come up with the money, but it is sort of like taking one credit card and paying off another credit card because we still owe the money to Social Security.

The suggestion by the Clinton-Gore administration and by Republicans and Democrats is that if we use all these funds by the year 2013 or 2014, we will have paid down that portion of the debt held by the public, the \$3.6 trillion. That sounds good.

But what happens if we do nothing to take care of the long-term problem of Social Security? That debt starts to go back up again. So the paying off is just a blip. Because when the baby-boomers retire, they go out of the paying-in mode and go into the taking-out mode to take Social Security benefits. We change from a dramatic situation of no longer will Social Security taxes be enough to pay existing benefits. So we have a cash flow problem.

Currently, in this country, our total debt represents 35 percent of gross domestic product. By 2013, if we use all of the money to pay it back, then it gets to zero on the debt that we owe the public. But eventually that goes back up to 65 percent if we borrow the money to pay the benefits that we have promised Social Security.

Let me review this chart, sort of a Federal Government spending. The pie chart represents where the Federal budget is being spent this year. Starting at the bottom at 6 o'clock, Social Security is 20 percent. Going clockwise, another entitlement, Medicare, is 11 percent. Medicare eventually, in the next 25 years, will over take Social Security as a cost.

□ 1730

We have Medicaid, the health care program for low-income. The other entitlements represent 14 percent. Domestic discretionary spending represents 19 percent. Defense represents 17 percent; interest, 13 percent of the total budget. Social Security is the biggest program. It is the biggest program in this country. It is the biggest program of any country in the world. And it has been quite successful, so it deserves our attention this presidential election year. So let the debate begin. Let us start talking about it. Let us increase our understanding of the predicament, of the problem, of the estimate by the Social Security Administration actuaries that Social Security is going broke.

Here is why. We have a current surplus coming in from the Social Security tax. The actuaries estimate that somewhere between 2011 and 2014, the cash flow problem will hit us and we go into the red. The red represents that we are going to have to come up with that money. Through cutting other government programs? I doubt it. Increasing taxes? It is going to be hard for politicians to do that. Increased borrowing? Probably the majority of this body, Republicans and Democrats, will say, "Well, let's borrow the money because you can't see that as evidently what we are running as far as a debt that we are leaving to our kids and grandkids."

I am a farmer. I am from a farm. What we grew up doing is saying, we are going to try to pay down the mortgage so that there is a lesser obligation for our kids and grandkids. What we are doing in the Federal Government by not dealing with this problem of Social Security and Medicare entitlements is we are increasing the burden, increasing the mortgage for them to pay in their future years. It is not fair. Let us discuss and debate it this election year.

#### TRADE WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PASCARELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, in the next hour, many of us in the Congress will lay out what our position is on the China trade vote, which is to come up in a very short period of time.

The time has arrived for a vote on what is now commonly referred to as permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, for China. We used to call this MFN, or most-favored-nation status. I suppose the proponents thought PNTR sounded kinder and gentler. But bad policy is bad policy, no matter what we call it. So here we are again. This year, the vote is a little different. If annual NTR was not bad enough, this year we are going to vote for permanent NTR status for China. Our argument is not and should not be with the Chinese people. This vote is not a referendum on the 1 billion people who are forced to live under Communist tyranny. This argument is about America's relationship with the Chinese government.

What has the Chinese government done to deserve PNTR? They have not improved the living conditions of their people as China is one of the worst offenders of human rights in the world. China is a country that does not tolerate political dissent or free speech. In the New York Times this past Monday, we see story upon story. This government uses executions and torture to maintain order, to persecute religious minorities, and to violate workers' rights. The State Department report on human rights practices in China is filled with atrocities. Our trade with China has increased, and yet human rights practices are getting worse.

Some feel that American jobs will be lost if PNTR is not passed. The growth in exports would generate 325,000 new jobs. This will not match the over 1 million jobs lost in the United States due to rising imports from the low wages in China. This is a net loss of an additional 817,000 jobs, on top of the 880,000 jobs already lost due to our current trade deficit with China. How can we do something so great in raising the minimum wage for our workers, for our families, and in the next breath give first-class treatment to a nation that features slave labor prison camps as part of its manufacturing community?

And have they made strides to make our trading privileges reciprocal? Has our trade deficit decreased? No, it is now \$68.7 billion and climbing, an increase of 14.6 percent, a 6 to 1 ratio of imports to exports, the most unbalanced relationship we have had in trade in United States history. But I do not see the infrastructure in China to accept any substantial amount of American merchandise. Who, making 13 cents an hour, can afford to buy an automobile? Why would the Chinese government purchase American software for their computers when they already run pirated versions of our own software?

We have seen the failure of NAFTA to improve the living conditions in

Mexico. This deal is not any different. Maybe China has acted favorably with regards to weapons proliferation. Let us look there. No, they have failed on that front as well. The People's Republic of China refused to join the Missile Technology Control Regime, despite President Clinton's offer in 1998 to support full participation. China is the only major nuclear supplier to shun the 35-nation nuclear suppliers group that requires full scope safeguards. They rejected entry into MTCR as well as NSG.

And the administration's reaction is to bring up this final vote? Is this our response? It simply does not make sense. This vote determines the message we are going to send to the Communist government in China. Are we going to vote to give permanent most-favored-nation status to China, thereby giving tacit approval to the Chinese government's practices and policies? Would that really be the normal thing for us to do? Or can we make a stand for a change here and now?

Let us have a novel idea. Let us say, no, your policies are not acceptable to the people of the United States. Our workers, our clergy, our families say no. This is not a government in China that we have been able to trust. They have broken every commitment they have made with the United States of America. It has broken every trade agreement it has signed with the United States over the past 10 years. This year will not be any different. I see no reason to end our annual renewal at this juncture in time. We should not vote to rubber-stamp a failed trading arrangement into infinity. That fails our people and it is wrong. Trade rights should be a privilege to be earned, not a right merely handed out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that we are less than 2 weeks from a vote that will ask Congress to permanently give up our economic trade leverage with China, permanently, not year by year but permanently. Considering China's abysmal record regarding previous trade agreements, it makes no sense for Congress to give up our annual review of China as a trading partner.

The question becomes simple, it becomes straightforward; namely, why should we reward China for its terrible record of violating past trade commitments with a permanent special trade status? Why? Some Members of the House will argue that trade with China will put an end to these past abuses as well as bolster the U.S. economy. They are wrong on both counts. Trade is beneficial only if it is a two-way street. But right now, there is no way that we can characterize our trading relationship with China as reciprocal.

It is a fact that we have a trade deficit with China in the billions of dol-

lars. Furthermore, the economic benefit of trading with a repressive nation is negligible when we consider how workers are treated, especially child workers in China. China workers are being exploited in order for the United States to receive benefit, benefit from low pay, benefit from no workers' rights, benefit from outrageous human rights practices.

Some of my colleagues will go even further and argue that China has made progress in many areas over the last few years. But when I see harassment of religious leaders, the sale of weapons technology to rogue states, imprisonment of students and those who dare to speak their minds, I have to ask, is that progress? And, of course, the answer is no, that is not progress. Congress cannot be fooled. We must not be fooled into thinking that the same failed policy of economic engagement would be different this time around, particularly if the agreement is permanent.

It is very much like thinking you have fallen in love with somebody who has a lot of faults and saying, I am going to marry this guy, and then I am going to change him. That does not work, and we know it. It is long overdue for U.S. trade policy to address human rights and workers' rights, not only with China but with all of our trade partners and with all of our trade negotiations. Trade cannot be free, it cannot be fair when there is no freedom and no fairness for the citizens of the country involved. Yet year after year our policy of granting special trade status to China has not resulted in improved human rights.

As it stands now, this trade deal does not address China's horrendous record of failure to abide by internationally recognized human rights and workers' rights. And how long are we going to ignore China's continuing policy of forced child labor? Child labor is known to be concentrated in China's southern coastal cities. It is estimated that hundreds of thousands of children migrate with their parents from rural areas to this export processing area to engage in income-earning activities. The conditions these children work under are horrific.

For example, we are familiar with the scenarios like the Nike company negotiating a deal with a sweatshop in China to pay teenage girls 16 cents an hour to make gym shoes that sell here in our country for \$120 a pair. However, reports often overlook other foreign-invested textile enterprises like the one in Guang Dong that employed 400 rural migrants. 160 of these were child workers. At this plant, a 14-year-old girl, exhausted from working 18 hours a day, fainted. As she fell, her hair was pulled into a machine and she died on the spot.

These worker abuses are not limited, though, to just the large multinational corporations. In December of 1994, China Women's News reported on a brick shop owner in Henan Province

using forced child labor. The children had to carry bricks for over 10 hours each day and were fed only melon soup.

□ 1745

Here, more than 40 workers shared a makeshift hut. Moreover, they were not given one cent of the wages they had been promised.

The contractor employed guards to keep watch on them 24 hours a day, and on August 13, 1994, the workers started a fight as a distraction so that two children could escape and report the case to the public security bureau. When the police arrived, more than 100 child workers were found in the brick shop.

While arrests were made for this one incident, no further information is available on follow-up activities or punishment of the forced labor violations.

These examples highlight serious reasons that we cannot give up our annual review of China. Why should we tempt our own corporations to shift appropriation to China where labor is undeniably cheaper, where there is less oversight on working conditions, and where those who disagree have no right to organize against their oppressors. Chinese workers, especially forced child laborers, have no power to speak out for a better deal, no right to organize, no right to basic dignity. There is little hope for improvement unless we as a Nation are courageous enough to take a stand and say, we do not support it.

An annual review of China's trade status is our only leverage to pressure China to make progress on worker and human rights. Like many others throughout the country, my constituents in Marin and Sanoma Counties support free trade, but they overwhelmingly want the United States to engage in responsible trade policy. Free and fair trade is important, but they do not feel it is more important than freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom to vote, or freedom to enjoy the most basic of human rights, including the rights of workers.

The United States is already China's best customer. We buy all their stuff. I do not believe we need to give China authorities another economic incentive to change by granting permanent Most Favored Nation status. Instead, if we use our economic clout, if we have the courage to leverage our economic strength for real reform, we will give the people of China a chance to help themselves. When China starts to live up to its agreements, when it starts to demonstrate a real commitment to human rights, only then should we consider granting permanent trading status to China.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for granting me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the modern world today, we see a world where multinational corporations controlling billions of dollars can, with the tap of the mouse, in a short e-mail, move manufacturing plants, facilities and capital from one country to another in the never-ending pursuit of higher profits. Untold numbers of American workers have had their lives disrupted like chess pieces on a chess board. Day after day, night after night, the evening news and Wall Street economists trumpet our economic prosperity in the 1990s. We see record corporate profits drive the stock market to all-time highs, and an elite group of shareholders partaking in the profits.

Unfortunately, they do not normally talk about the real lives and real people hidden behind the rosy statistics of economic growth. Real people who are coming to the conclusion that unfortunately, the American dream may be just a dream in reality. They do not talk about a Nation where working families pay more and more taxes and big business pays less and less. They do not talk about stacked wages that have plagued the American middle class for well over a decade.

They do not talk about big business and the 111,000 layoffs in 1998 that jumped 600 percent to a record 677,795 layoffs in 1998. That is 600 percent in less than 10 years to 677,795 layoffs in 1998 alone. They do not talk about the \$68 billion trade deficit with China. They do not talk about the 2.6 million manufacturing jobs sucked away by our growing trade deficit in the last 20 years alone. That is 2.6 million manufacturing jobs. They do not talk about the subjugation of public values and even patriotism to the continual pursuit of potential profits.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things Wall Street does not want to talk about, and there are a lot of things they do not want American working families to know. So they only tell us what they want us to hear. We hear about how free trade and free markets are such wonderful things, that we need to give PNTR to China for us to continue our robust economic growth. But contrary to the elitist proclamation of the high priests of free trade, free trade will not save the world and it certainly is not going to save the surging U.S. trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, giving China PNTR will only make a bad situation even worse. We already have an unfair trading relationship. On average, we only apply a 2 percent tariff on Chinese products. China turns around and slaps a 17 percent tariff on U.S. products, even after the U.S. and China had an agreement back in 1992 where China promised to remove major market barriers to U.S. products. China broke that promise. Again I say, China broke that promise.

So what is to say that China will not break the one brokered and agreed to last year? What is to say that China, after agreeing to certain concessions in return for the Clinton administration's

support for China's acceptance by WTO will not turn around and break the agreement once again? The Chinese leaders in Beijing did it at least once before and, in my opinion, they will certainly do it again.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. China is still a totalitarian regime run by a single party, the Chinese Communist party, and it is a party that is intent on keeping its grip on power.

We did not give PNTR to the Soviet Union when it was a Communist dictatorship. We did not give it to Cuba. We did not give it to North Korea. We did not give it to Libya. Why should we treat China any differently? The answer is quite simple: We should not.

Mr. Speaker, PNTR comes to a vote before this body next week. I urge all of my colleagues to think about this and how this trade deal could possibly benefit American workers, or, for that matter, workers across this world. Really, that is the simple question: does this benefit working men and women in this country or around the world? The very simple, direct answer is no, and that is the way we should vote on this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I want to congratulate him and my friend from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for an outstanding statement. I think the gentleman from Illinois has got this right on the money. He understands completely what is happening here, as does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and others.

What we are here tonight to discuss the issue of trade with China and Most Favored Nation status, but also to focus in on the question of human rights and how that is important in our talks and negotiations in our relationships with other nations.

Let me just say at the outset and reiterate what my friend from New Jersey has said. The Chinese government is a brutal, authoritarian, police State. If someone opposes the government on religious grounds, on trade unionist grounds, on democratization, political democratization grounds, that someone will end up in jail. It is as simple and as painful and as stark as that. The jails in China are filled with people who dared to try to express themselves religiously. Catholics, Buddhists, Protestants, Muslims, all languishing in jail because they dare practice their religion. We have had Catholic archbishops languish in jail in China for 30 years, and that repression continues today.

The New York Times yesterday wrote something about China cracking down on liberal intellectuals, and they said, and I quote, "China's leaders are trying to rein in a growing and increasingly assertive liberal intellectual

movement, criticizing prominent academics and authors in speeches, forbidding newspapers from running their articles, and punishing or shutting down publishers who have brought out their work."

"Despite his western-leaning, economics President Jiang Zemin has, in the last year, constantly reiterated the importance of standing fast by Communist ideology."

The New York Times goes on to say, "In the last few months, those admonitions have led to a series of punitive actions against writers perceived as straying too far in a liberal or reformist direction."

Liberal intellectuals have been criticized. Publishing houses have been shut down. Academics have been fired. Newspaper editors have been fired.

This is the latest in a long series of crackdowns the regime in Beijing has undertaken to suppress dissent, stifle democracy activists, and maintain absolute and maximum control.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commission on Religious Freedom last week, the Commission on Religious Freedom issued their annual report. The Commission, I would tell my colleagues, is an independent group. Seven of its 9 members were appointed by supporters of permanent Most Favored Nation status for China. The Commission opposes permanent MFN for China without substantial human rights improvements. Rabbi David Saperstein, a highly respected religious leader, is the chairman of the Commission.

Experts from the Commission's findings and recommendations are, and I quote, "Chinese government violations of religious freedom increased markedly during the past year. Roman Catholics and Protestant underground 'house churches' suffered increased repression; the crackdown included the arrests of bishops, priests, and pastors, one of whom was found dead in the street soon afterward. Several Catholic bishops were ordained by the government without the Vatican's participation or approval."

"The repression of Tibetan Buddhists expanded; government authorities in Tibet, in defiance of the Dalai Lama, named Reting Lama. Another important religious leader, the Karmapa Lama, fled to India."

"Muslim Uighurs, having turned increasingly to Islamic institutions for leadership in recent years, faced heightened repression of their religious and other human rights, as they responded to a deliberate government campaign to move Han Chinese into the region in order to out-populate the Uighurs, the Muslims, in their own land."

□ 1800

While many on the Commission support free trade, the Commission believes that the United States Congress should grant China permanent normal trade relations status only after China makes substantial improvements in respect for religious freedom.

Michael Young of George Washington University Law School, who described himself as a passionate believer in free trade, said, "The extraordinary deterioration of religious freedom in China is close to unprecedented since the days of Mao." Mr. Young cited cases of women beaten to death by police for trying to practice their religion.

The conditions the Commission has laid out are reasonable, and they include the following:

Require China to provide unhindered access to religious leaders, including those in prison, detained, or under house arrest in China;

Release from prison all religious prisoners in China;

Require China to ratify the International Convention of Civil and Political Rights.

If we look at our own State Department country reports on human rights practices, they state in their latest report that China's "poor human rights record deteriorated markedly throughout the year, as the government intensified efforts to suppress dissent, particularly organized dissent . . . The government continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms."

Permanent MFN supporters claim that the Internet and technology will unshackle the Chinese people, but the record shows the opposite has happened. According to the State Department, authorities have blocked at various times politically sensitive websites, including those of dissident groups and some major foreign news organizations such as Voice of America, the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the British Broadcasting System.

The news is also not good for workers in China. They pay workers in manufacturing in China a miserable 13 cents an hour. We have heard about the sweatshops and we have heard about the child labor. We have heard about the beatings of women in the workplace, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) so eloquently demonstrated for us just a few minutes ago on the floor.

If you are a worker and you stand up for workers organizing for workers' rights or for better wages, if you stand up for workers, you are going to end up in jail. "The government continued to tightly restrict worker rights, and forced labor in prison facilities remains a serious problem," said the State Department in the report.

For instance, there is the case of Guo Yunqiao, who led a protest march of 10,000 workers to local government offices following the 1989 massacre. He is currently serving for that act a term of life in prison on charges of hooliganism for leading a protest.

In the case of Guo Qiqing, who was detained in Shayang County on charges of disrupting public order, he had organized a sit-in to demand money owed to the workers.

There is the case of Hu Shigen, an activist with the Federal Labour Union in China, who is imprisoned in Number 2 prison in Beijing and has 12 years remaining on his sentence. Mr. Hu is seriously ill and has been charged with "counter-revolutionary crimes."

The list goes on and on and on. I think people get the point. What is going on in China is a brutal, suppressive military police state. It is simply that. For us to reward them for this behavior after they have been put on notice by their own people and by the world community year after year after year sends the complete opposite message of that which we should be sending to the Chinese government.

It is ironic to me that governments now who operate in a suppressive manner seem to be the governments in the world who are receiving, in many instances, the open arms of capitalists, free enterprise, free markets.

The argument the other side makes is, well, the free market will lead to economic, democratic, political reforms, and religious reforms. The reality is just the opposite. I do not think a lot of my friends have read Orwell. They could use this technology to suppress as well as they could to open up.

The fact of the matter is that the Chinese have and still are suppressing their people on religious, trade unionist, and political grounds. So it is very clear to me that what we have here is a situation that needs our most fervent attention. We need to be standing up for Wei Jingsheng and for Harry Wu, who spent countless years in jail fighting for the right for their own people to speak on a political, an economic, and on religious grounds that they cannot do today. I want to be associated with those people.

People say, well, the market opened up America. A market did not open up America. The United States of America and the reforms that we have here, the political process that we have here, the right to practice our religion, the right of trade unionists to organize, collectively bargain, fight for a decent wage, a better living standard, a better pension, all the things that we have today, those did not come from the free market, they come from people who challenged the free market, who marched, who demonstrated, who were beaten, who went to jail, and some even died in order that people would have the right to vote, in order that people could form political parties, in order that people could make a decent wage and have a pension and have health care and have education for their kids.

That came at a terrible price, but it was a price they felt worth paying, and it is a price that all of us have benefited from for the last 100 years in this country.

That same dynamic is going on in the developing world and it is going on in China today. The question we have to ask ourselves, is who are we going to associate ourselves with? Who are we

going to stand with? Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of those who are struggling for these basic decent human freedoms that were struggled and fought for in our country, or are we going to be on the side of the free market unfettered capitalist approach that has not worked in opening up a society and providing these freedoms, and that will not work unless it is tempered with some basic human decency and dignity?

I suggest that the American people overwhelmingly choose the side that we represent and are on today. So I just want to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and my other colleague who has been the champion of this issue, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their passion on this issue and for standing up.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has talked quite well and quite eloquently in the past about this dynamic of multinational corporations moving in to nations that restrict these basic freedoms because that will give them a free hand, free leverage in which to maximize their profits. That is exactly what is going on with globalization.

Unless we take on this issue of globalization in a humane, decent way, open it up, give seats at the decision-making table to those who represent labor and the environment and human rights, we will continue on this path of oppression and we will be a weaker Nation as a result of that in more than just a material way; we will be weaker in terms of our moral standing within our community, and we will betray the basic tenets of our Founding Fathers and the grandparents and ancestors who fought for these liberties that the Chinese dissidents are so valiantly struggling for today.

I thank my colleague. I appreciate his time for coming down and speaking on this issue. I know my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has similar thoughts on this issue. I would love to hear from him.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I thank him for his leadership, as well.

I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this issue in organizing this special order, and special thanks to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her leadership and good will and good work on this, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), who has been fighting the right fight on trade issues, unfair trade issues, for at least this whole decade.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) stood in this hall with me and several others, but he was here night after night during the debate on the North American Free Trade Agreement

in opposition to it, and what he predicted and what he projected absolutely, unfortunately, has come true in relations with that country and our trading partners that way. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has a perfect understanding of what is happening with globalization.

As we walk the halls in this job and go back and forth between committee hearings and meetings in our office and the House floor, we have seen more CEOs of America's largest corporations walking the halls than at any time of the year. Every time we vote on China trade relations, there are more corporate jets at National Airport, more CEOs walking the halls of this Congress.

When one of them stops and talks to us, they invariably say that engagement with China will mean more democracy with China; that as we go to China, as we trade and engage with them more, as we sell them more and buy more from them, that democracy will be able to flourish in China.

They have been telling us that for 10 years, when our trade deficit with China in 1989 was \$100 million, million with an M, and today that trade deficit with China with this engagement that we have undertaken with the Chinese, our trade deficit now is \$70 billion with a B, \$70 billion. But they continue to tell us over and over, let us do more of this with China, more engagement, more trade, and things in China will get better.

They tell us that there are 1.2 billion potential consumers in China. What they do not tell us is their interest is that China has 1.2 billion potential workers for those American corporations and other western companies that invest in China and sell products back to the United States.

The real question on globalization and democratization, perceived democratization, predicted democratization of developing countries like China, the real issue boils down to this: that as we have engaged more with developing countries, as investors have gone into developing countries, western investment has shifted from those developing countries that are democracies to those developing countries that are authoritarian governments.

We see fewer investment dollars going to India, a democracy, the world's largest democracy, and more investment dollars going to China. We see fewer investment dollars, relatively, going to Taiwan and South Korea, democracies, and more investment dollars going to countries like Indonesia, authoritarian governments.

In the postwar decade the share of developing country exports to the United States for democratic nations fell from 53 percent to 34 percent. In other words, corporations want to do business with countries with docile work forces, with countries where people earn below poverty wages, in countries where people are not allowed to organize and bargain collectively, in

countries that pay 25 cents an hour. They have been moving away from democracies into authoritarian countries.

In manufacturing goods, developing democracies' share of exports fell 21 percentage points, from 56 percent to 35 percent. Again, corporations, Western investors, are choosing to move away from democracies in their investments, developing democracies, and going to developing authoritarian countries, because U.S. investors like the idea of a docile work force, like the idea of workers that cannot talk back, like the idea of workers with low wages, like the idea of investing in countries where the government is not free, where workers simply do what they are told.

In example after example, we can see investment moving from those democracies to countries like China. China has certainly been the largest one where that has happened.

Again, these CEOs that roam the halls of Congress these days and tell us that if we engage with China it will mean more democracy in China, these same CEOs will have us believe that their interest in China, their going to China, will cause this blossoming of democracy, this blooming of democracy in China.

But look who the major players in Communist China today are, those people who are the major decision-makers in the direction that Chinese society goes: the Communist Party of China; the People's Liberation Army in China, which controls many of the businesses that export to the United States; and Western investors.

Which of those three entities, the Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, or large Western companies, multinational companies, which of those three groups want to empower workers? Which of those three groups want to pay higher wages? Which of those three groups want more democracy in China? Which of those three groups want to change markedly Chinese society?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that none of these three groups want to see change in these societies. That is why Western investment finds its way into countries like China, rather than a country like India.

If American business investors in China and around the world really want a democracy, they would not be going to China. They would not be taking development dollars out of democratic countries and putting them in authoritarian states. That is why the argument they make, that engagement with China will mean a more democratic world and a more prosperous and democratic China, is absolutely bogus.

Mr. Speaker, we as a Nation, we as a Nation have no business rewarding investors that go to countries like China instead of countries like India. We have no business taking sides in that sense by rewarding those countries and those investors whose values run very

different from ours, run counter to ours.

In this country, in this Congress, we believe in democracy, we believe in free markets, we believe in people being able to move from one job to another, we believe in people being organized and bargaining collectively. We believe in the kind of democratic values that made this country great.

Our passing PNTR is going to mean more of the same in China: more repression, more oppression from the government, a government that resists democracy because they have the power to.

We will be making those same entities, the Communist party, the People's Liberation Army of China, much more powerful if we continue to pour monies in and give them most-favored-nation status.

□ 1815

So, Mr. Speaker, I would again thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) for this time. I congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the good work she does, and urge my colleagues to vote no on Permanent Most Favored Nation Status for the People's Republic of China.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I now recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and for his very substantial leadership on this issue to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is the gentleman yielding to me?

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. PASCARELL. We have to get one, two, three more speakers in.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, some people think I can talk all day on China and are afraid that I will, so I will try to be succinct and get to just a few basic points, because so many of my colleagues have touched on the very serious human rights violations and the very substantial trade violations.

Mr. Speaker, China has violated agreements between our two countries and, of course, there is the issue of proliferation. I think I will focus in the short time allotted to me, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that today a number of our former Presidents joined President Clinton in calling for Congress to pass Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China. These Presidents, who have been a part and parcel of this policy which is a total failure, are asking Members of Congress to put their good names next to a policy that has failed in every respect.

Permanent Normal Trade Relations is the cornerstone of the Clinton-Bush China policy. There are three areas of concern that we have in our country about that policy. First of all, and in

no particular order of priority, we have the issue, since this is a trade issue, of the substantial violations of our trade relationship which continue. When we started this debate, we were talking about 1, 2, \$3 billion that was the trade deficit we suffered with China. That was over a decade ago. Now the trade deficit for this year is projected to be over \$80 billion.

So this idea that if we kowtowed to the regime, and we gave them MFN, Most Favored Nation status, now called Permanent Normal Trade Relations, the name has been changed to protect the guilty, if we do that then the China market will be opened to U.S. products, it simply has not happened.

In the area of trade, China has violated every trade agreement, be it the market access agreement, the agreement on intellectual property, the agreement on use of prison labor for export, the agreement on transshipments, any trade agreement we can name.

So, President Clinton is sending us this request for Permanent Normal Trade Relations based on the 1999 U.S.-China trade agreement. What reason do we have to think that China will honor that? The President's request is based on broken promises, not proven performance.

Already, China is engaged in its traditional reinterpretation of the agreement. For example, let me give some comparisons. The Trade Rep's fact sheet, our Trade Rep's fact sheet says China will import all types of U.S. wheat from all regions of the U.S. to all ports in China. China's Trade Rep says it is a complete misunderstanding to expect this grain to enter the country. Beijing only conceded a theoretical opportunity for the export of grain.

On meat, China, according to our fact sheet, the U.S. Trade Rep's fact sheet, China will lift the ban on U.S. exports of all meat and poultry. China's negotiator said diplomatic negotiations involve finding new expressions. If we find a new expression, this means we have achieved a diplomatic result. In terms of meat imports, we have not actually made any material concessions.

The ink is not even dry on this agreement. This is a 1999 agreement that is already being reinterpreted by the regime. The list goes on: Petroleum, telecommunications, insurance, et cetera. I talked about the history of it and I do not have enough time to go into the history of their trade violations.

Some would lead us to believe that we who are opposing this request of the President are willing to risk U.S. jobs in support of promoting human rights in China. But the facts point to a situation where this is a very bad deal on the basis of trade alone. On the basis of trade alone. If we could forget the brutal occupation of Tibet. If we could forget the serious repression of religious and political freedom in China. If we could forget that for a moment. If we

could forget China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. That would be chemical, biological and nuclear technology to Iran, to Pakistan, to the Sudan, to Libya.

To Libya, it is very recent. This is a major embarrassment in the Clinton administration policy. But fortunately for them, this information came out during the Easter break and it has not really sunk in. But this is a very serious violation. And it proves again that kowtowing to the regime does not get us any better benefits in terms of stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, making the world a safer place, any fairer treatment, making a fairer deal.

Mr. Speaker, they want us to give China a blank check, while China gives us a rubber check by not even honoring the deal that they are putting forth. And then in terms of human rights, we are a country of values. When people say, well, other countries do not do this. We are not other countries. We are the United States of America. We are the freest country in the world and we have a commitment to promote the aspirations of people who aspire to freedom. That does not mean we go to war for them or anything like that, but it does mean that we should at least, at least recognize the repression they are suffering for freedom.

Wei Jingsheng, a hero. He has spent many, many years of his life, probably half of his adult life in prison. Harry Wu has spent years in prison. They know that the United States must not act from fear of what the Chinese regime might do. We have to act from strength and confidence in our own sense of values.

So when the President says, "Oh, you either want to isolate China or engage China," he does a grave disservice to this very serious debate. Certainly we need to engage China, but we need to do it in a sustainable way that sustains our values and sustains our economy and sustains a world peace in making the world a safer place.

The administration is willing to ignore Tibet and China and all of that. They are willing, more seriously, to ignore China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. They are willing to say that the human rights situation is improving in China, when we have the National Catholic Conference of Bishops supporting us; when we have, as was mentioned by others, the new Commission on Religious Freedom supporting us in this, and the list goes on. In terms of the environment, the Sierra Club, in terms of agriculture, the National Farmers Union, the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the working people of America to oppose this and say to the President there is a way to do it. A decent way. And it is a way that says let us see some proven performance before we surrender to the dictates of the Beijing regime the only leverage we have, which is our annual review.

So it is not about "engage or isolate." Certainly we engage. It is not about whether we trade or not. Certainly we trade. It is a question of how we do it. And it does not have to be according to the terms and the timing of the Beijing regime, but more in keeping with what is right and what is appropriate for our great country. We are leaders in the world; we should continue to be so. And I would hope that the President and the former Presidents would respect the intelligence of the Members of Congress to know that they should not ask us to place our good name next to their failed policy just so that we can help redeem the lack of success they have, instead of allowing us to go forward in a very positive way.

We all have a responsibility. We all have a responsibility to come to an agreement on trade with China that is responsible. Give us a chance to do that. I urge my colleagues not to support this, but to allow us to do it right and not according to the terms and timing of the regime in Beijing. With that, I will yield back.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. Interestingly, on this piece of legislation we have all of corporate America telling us what a good deal it is and the multinationals are pouring huge sums of money into this campaign. But, meanwhile on the other side, we have trade unions representing millions of workers who are saying this is a bad deal for American workers. We have most of the environmental organizations in this country who are saying this is a bad deal for the environment in this world. We have human rights organizations and religious organizations who are saying this is a bad deal if we are concerned about human rights and the dignity of people.

So on one side are the big money people who, over the last 20 years, have invested over \$60 billion in China in search of labor there where people are paid 15, 20, or 25 cents an hour. And not surprisingly, these people have concluded that this is a great agreement. Well, I suppose it is if one is a multinational corporation who wants to throw American workers out on the street and hire people at 15 or 20 cents an hour. I can understand why they think it is a good deal.

But it is not a good deal for American workers. American workers should not be asked to compete against desperate people in China who are forced to work at starvation wages, who cannot form free trade unions, who do not even have the legal right to stand up and criticize their government.

The truth of the matter is that in the midst of the so-called economic boom, the average American today is working longer hours for lower wages. One of the reasons is that we have a miserable

failed trade policy that has cost us millions of jobs and that has forced wages down in this country.

So I will be very brief because I know that there are other speakers, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is here. But I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this PNTR. Stand up for American workers, for human rights, and for the environment and let us have the courage to take on the big money interests.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I now recognize the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the balance of our time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for his leadership on this. We could not ask for a better Member of Congress. I also want to thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for allowing me these few minutes, and I will try not to use all the time.

It has been a joy to work with our colleagues to open up the truth about China to the American people. And today in Congress, we held a bipartisan hearing on one of the dimensions of this debate that has not been talked about. We called our hearing "Women in China, Women in Chains". C-SPAN was there for the entirety of this hearing where there were four witnesses, women from China who came to tell their incredibly compelling stories. Stories of repression. Stories of forced abortion. Stories of missing women and children. Stories of women in the countryside and in factories as exploited workers. Women married to men who are fighting for democracy, many in prison from 10 to 30 years. Other women imprisoned because they participated in a spiritual group, Falun Gong.

Other women from Tibet. A young woman whose roommate had demonstrated in Tiananmen Square and was shot dead, and that young woman today came before our committee. She had been activated through that, even though she is a physicist by training, telling how she has gotten involved in trying to tell the American people the true story of what is happening in China. And the story of women workers in the countryside who are producing the majority of food in that country. Women in the factories, exploited women workers, their voices we tried to lift up.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to let the membership know that the hearing itself, because it was recorded on C-SPAN, is being advertised on their Web site at [www.cspan.org](http://www.cspan.org). My colleagues can look for the hearing on women's rights in China to hear the truth about what is happening in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who was here, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the gentlewoman from

New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for joining us today and helping us to listen to these stories where women basically told us, look, the only time that prisoners who are democracy demonstrators are let go in China is during the debate here in the Congress of the United States on trade with China.

□ 1830

They said please do not give that away. If you give this power from the United States to the World Trade Organization, the enforcement will not occur. We are the only Nation in the world raising concerns about Communism in China. And once it goes to the WTO, it will be lost. America will retain her power by using our bilateral trade negotiations with China to at least, at least give voice to over 1.2 billion people who cannot voice their own opinions inside their society.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) so very much. You truly have been a leader, not just for America's workers and farmers but for the worlds and a liberty-loving Member, obviously of this Congress. And, as I said, to the people who assembled at the hearing this morning, the flag over this Capitol flies 24 hours a day and it flies not just for America but for the cause of liberty everywhere.

For those women today who testified, who cannot return to China in fear for the lives of their families and relatives, we stood proud with them today. We understood what this Constitution is all about, and we hope that the young people of our country will watch [www.cspan.org](http://www.cspan.org) to see the world's new democracy fighters in countries like China who are paying the most precious price with their lives, sacrificing their families, giving everything to try to bring a greater measure of freedom to a country that still remains Communist in every aspect of life there. I thank the gentleman so very, very much. Please watch [www.cspan.org](http://www.cspan.org). Look when this program will be broadcast.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I thank the speaker for your patience and endurance.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASCRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

#### REPORT ON TEXAS A&M BONFIRE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the University of Texas and Texas A&M have been playing football for over 100 years. It is one of the most intense athletic rivalries in the Lone Star State. In 1909, students at Texas A&M began a tradition that we now call bonfire. They went out and gathered old packing crates and pallets and trash and limbs from the community and built a bonfire to testify to their undying commitment to beat the Uni-

versity of Texas in the annual Thanksgiving football game.

By the mid 1940s, what had been basically an exercise in getting some logs and some trash and had grown into quite an operation, and the 2 years that I worked on bonfire in 1968 and 1969, the stack, the height of the bonfire reached 109 feet.

It is not unusual today for a bonfire at Texas A&M before the University of Texas football game to weigh over 2 million pounds, to have 5,000 to 7,000 logs and to be in the 70-foot to 80-foot range. Because of some accidents and concerns about environmental issues beginning in the 1980s, the administration at Texas A&M put a limitation on the number of logs, the height of the stack, the diameter of the stack.

This past November, I believe, on November the 18th, two days before the game, the bonfire collapsed, killing 12 students and injuring 27 others, a terrible, terrible tragedy by any definition. As a consequence of the bonfire collapse and the injuries and the death, the administration at Texas A&M put together a Bonfire Commission to go out and investigate the causes of the problem and to determine what, if anything, should be done to correct the problems, and whether to even have a bonfire.

This is the report that was released last week. It is approximately 2½ inches in diameter. It does not make any recommendations to the administration at A&M to do, but it does determine what caused the collapse. The chairman of the commission is a distinguished engineer named Leo Linbeck from Houston, Texas, and the commission members are Veronica Callaghan, retired major general Hugh Robinson, Alan Shivers, Jr., William E. Tucker, the consultants are McKinsey & Company, Fay Engineering, Packer Engineering, Kroll-O'Gara and Performance Improvement International.

It cost about \$2 million. They interviewed several thousand witnesses. They have over 5,000 pages of documents. The conclusion of the Bonfire Commission is that the bonfire collapse was because of structural failure, the weight of the logs on the top stacks became so great that it forced a pressure down into the first stack, that created a lateral pressure that forced the logs on the bottom stack to come out, and there was a catastrophic collapse.

They investigated, researched whether human factors such as alcoholic consumption, horseplay played a role in the collapse, and the answer is no; although, there was some of that, and it should be prohibited.

I think the Bonfire Commission has done a commendable job. They have been very extensive. I have glanced at the entire report. I have actually read page by page approximately half of it. And as a professional engineer myself, not a civil engineer, not a structural engineer, obviously, I am convinced that the commission has done its job in determining the causes of the problem.



The President of Texas A&M, Dr. Bowen, has said that he will consider this report and decide in the next 2 months whether to allow the bonfire tradition to continue or not, and if he makes a decision on whether to allow it, under what conditions it will be allowed.

This report makes no recommendations about whether it should or should not be continued, but it does point out some things that I think are worth highlighting.

Number one, one obviously need to have structural integrity of the bonfire. One needs to have professional oversight of the bonfire.

Under the tradition of Texas A&M, it has all been done by students. There was no written design, it had to be certified as having structural integrity. Each bonfire student leadership looked at what was been done the year before and then decided what to do this year.

I cannot tell Dr. Bowen what to do, but I would certainly think that some of the things he has got to consider is have a design that is actually on paper that has been certified as structurally sound by professional engineering groups, and then make sure that there is oversight to see that the design is actually implemented.

Speaking only for myself, I can certainly understand if Dr. Bowen decided not to allow the bonfire to continue, but I would hope that he will allow the tradition to continue under very restrictive and overseeing regulations.

#### PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, in the USA Today, I could not help but notice on the front page an article. It was called "HMOs Take Spiritual Approach." It is written by Julie Appleby. It starts out by saying "Health plans, buffeted in recent years by their no-frills approach to medical care, are pushing ever further into alternative medicine, hoping to find low cost ways to boost patient satisfaction. Need help understanding the meaning of life? No problem. A Denver-based HMO offers spiritual counseling, six visits at \$10 a pop. Fearing surgery? Blue Shield of California unveils a new prescription today, free audio cassettes for patients aimed at harnessing their imaginations to promote healing."

Mr. Speaker, when I read this and when I also read about some of the abuses by some of the HMOs, I think patients will need some of this spiritual healing to get over some of the ways that they have been treated by HMOs.

I want to talk tonight for a little while about where we stand in conference with the patient protection leg-

islation that passed the House and the Senate. My information on how the conference is going is from my sources on the Republican side. There have been reports that the conference is making some progress. Maybe a month ago, there was reported progress on emergency care provisions and also on a couple other smaller items that should be relatively noncontroversial. It should be pointed out that there has been no legislative language divulged from any of these earlier "agreements in principle."

But about a week or 2 ago, there was a report that there was progress being made on one of the most important parts of the bill, which is, how does one handle disputes between care that is requested by a patient and care denied by the HMO. In both the bill in the House and in the Senate, when there is a dispute on a denial of care by the HMO, a patient could take that to an external appeals panel.

The reports in the press seem to indicate that progress was made and that there was some sort of agreement between the Republicans and the Democrats in the House-Senate conference on this point. Well, I am sorry to inform my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here in the House that these reports have been vastly overplayed.

As a result of that, President Clinton asked for a meeting for this Thursday of conferees down at the White House to try to spur on progress on the patient's rights. But let me just point out some of the problems, these are from my Republican sources, on how there is not agreement on some of the fundamental aspects of the external appeals process.

For instance, there is not agreement on the standard for determining whether cases are eligible for review. Mr. Speaker, this is sort of fundamental. One has to know what kind of cases can go to review, and this has not been decided.

In determining whether a case is eligible for review, the independent reviewer should not be limited by a plan's definition or interpretations where they involve applications of medical judgment. This is what is in the House. This is the provision in the House where we say that the independent panel can make a determination on medical necessity that is not bound by the plan's own guidelines. They can be considered. The plan's guidelines can be considered, but the independent panel is not bound by those.

Also, it has not been decided in terms of protection, such as the independent panel determining medical necessity disputes on coverage or benefit determinations, and which of those are not subject to review.

Now, in the House bill, we say that if there is an explicit denial of coverage in the contract, then regardless of whether the patient needs that medical procedure or not, that independent panel cannot tell the HMO to give the care.

For instance, the HMO could write a contract saying we do not cover liver transplants. A patient could come along, maybe medically need a liver transplant, but under the House bill, the independent panel cannot tell the HMO to give that, because there is an explicit exclusion of coverage. But aside from that, this crucial question has not been decided in the conference.

Other things related to external review have not been decided in the conference. For instance, there has not been a decision on what to do with existing State laws that deal with external appeal systems. Now, in my opinion, the independent review should have the authority to direct the health plan to provide the care. That is what we passed here in the House with a vote of 275 to 151.

□ 1845

We said, okay, if there is a denial of care, if it has gone through an internal appeals process and goes to the external independent review panel, that that panel can tell the HMO to give the care. In our bill that passed the House, if the HMO does not give the care, then they are subject to a fine, a rather stiff fine. And if a patient is injured as a consequence of not receiving that care, then that plan would be liable for that. This has not been decided. This has not been decided in the conference.

Furthermore, one would think that this would be an easy thing that could have been decided, and that is that the panel should be independent from the HMO. Apparently, this has not been decided in the conference either. So all of those reports saying that significant progress was being made on the appeals process, I think, are vastly overblown.

Furthermore, I would point out to my colleagues, and I really do not need to tell them this, because all of them that have been here for more than 6 months know this is the case, that unless we see legislative language, we can talk all we want about "principles," but one simple clause in legislative language can totally turn the intent of that provision around. And there is no legislative language available.

So what do we have here? We have a situation where States all around the country are saying we need to do something about this. State legislature after State legislature have passed bills for patient protection. In fact, in Oklahoma, the State legislature just passed a law making it easier for patients to sue HMOs and other insurers for unreasonable denials of medical care. Under the Oklahoma law, a health plan can be required to pay damages if it fails to exercise "ordinary care" in treating patients.

The chief sponsor of the Oklahoma bill, State Senator Brad Henry, has said, "The chairman of the House Senate conference is definitely out of step with the public here in Oklahoma. Polling information shows that 72 percent of Oklahomans support giving the patient the right to sue."