

How would we want to unilaterally try to do this and hope to accomplish anything, whether on human rights, on trade, on piracy, if we are not willing to sit down and talk to either friend, foe or otherwise? We must be there at the table to try to get from them something. Otherwise, they are going to treat us the way we would treat any other enemy, like someone they do not need to deal with.

What about all the jobs in places like Los Angeles? We must protect those as well. At the end of the day it is better for us to engage and treat these folks like people we would sit down with rather than as economic pariah.

I urge Members to vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would like to remind the Members exactly what we are debating here. We are debating not whether or not we are ever going to talk to China again. We are not talking about cutting all relations or isolating China. We are talking about whether or not China should continue to have huge tariffs on our products while we let them flood their products into our country with low tariffs on their products while they keep our products out of their country with high tariffs.

We are also talking about whether or not our businesses that shut down factories here, whether those businessmen should be able to get taxpayer support, subsidies for their loans in setting up factories over there to use slave labor. Those are the issues we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, somewhere in America today, someone who served honorably in the American Armed Forces will be denied care at a Veterans' Administration hospital for lack of funds. Twelve thousand young soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines will continue to be eligible for food stamps because of lack of money. Military retirees who served our country honorably for 20 years will be told you can no longer go to the base hospital for lack of money.

Yet this Congress today will vote whether or not to give the Communist Chinese a \$20 billion tax break so they can continue to enjoy a \$60 billion trade surplus with our country which they will use to build the weapons, the technology of which they stole from us over the past decade.

That is what it is all about. No one wants to say it. This is a \$20 billion tax break for the most repressive government on this earth. A "yes" vote says that, "No, we're going to treat you the way you treat us and charge you what you charge us." A "no" vote is a \$20 billion tax break for the Communists.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of free trade.

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

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

In setting trade policy we must not assume that it is our job to solve any internal political problems of our trading partners any more than it is their responsibility to deal with our internal shortcomings.

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

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

Trade policy should never be mixed with the issue of domestic political problems. Dictatorial governments trading with freer nations are more likely to respect civil liberties if they are trading with them. Also, it is true that nations that trade are less likely to go to war with one another.

If all trade subsidies are eliminated, there is less temptation on our part to impose conditions on others receiving our grants and loans.

Before we assume that we can improve the political liberties of foreign citizens, we must meet the responsibility of protecting all civil liberties of our own citizens irrespective of whether it is guaranteeing first and second amendment protections or guaranteeing the balance of power between the states and the federal government as required by the ninth and tenth amendments.

Every argument today for trading with China is an argument for removing all sanctions with all nations including Cuba, Libya, Iran and Iraq. None of these nations come close to

being a threat to our national sovereignty. If trade with China is to help us commercially and help the cause of peace, so too would trade with all countries.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, rejecting this resolution and renewing NTR with China will help to safeguard American security with respect to a potential adversary, will serve American economic interests, and will encourage policies that will allow individual liberty, the rule of law and thus respect for human rights ultimately to flourish in China.

On the security front, NTR and the expanded trade opportunities that it brings in nonmilitarily sensitive goods reduces the likelihood of military conflict between the United States and China. Countries with extensive trade relations are simply less likely to go to war with each other than countries without these ties.

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

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

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

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this is supposed to be about trade, but I also