Columbus, MS, and Waterloo, NY. The families of the men killed in that war came together to place flowers by their gravestones. The veterans joined this practice, honoring their fallen comrades with their own recollections of courage and devotion on stricken fields. Ever since then, veterans and their families have led the observance of Memorial Day.

There have been times, during and right after wars, when most Americans have known some of these honored dead. Those who defend this country, after all, are men and women from every town and every walk of life. They are as ordinary as the earth they lie beneath, and more precious than diamonds.

But in prolonged times of peace, children are born and grow up never knowing anybody who fell in war. While peace is an immeasurable blessing, not to have known any of these honored dead is a loss. Some feel it in never knowing a father or other relative lost in combat. Others have no connection beyond gratitude.

Memorial Day brings that connection to our consciousness. On this day we are all aware of the service so many have given this Nation, and of what risk those who defend this nation share. This is a day, I would hope only one of many, on which the living remember and salute those who served our Nation in uniform and now lie at eternal rest.

On this Memorial Day, I would like to remember two fallen heroes from the Second Congressional District of Florida, which I have the distinct honor of representing in the House of Representatives. Air Force Master Sgt. Sherry Lynn Olds, of Panama City and Marine Sgt. Jesse N. Aliganga, of Tallahassee, made the ultimate sacrifice in the service of their country. These soldiers were two of 12 Americans that gave their lives in the August 7th, 1998, terrorist bombing of the United States Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya. On this day, we honor them and the many others that have gone before them, and the contributions all of them have made for us.

Service of this country in uniform has been, since the beginning, one of the greatest sources of unity and equality, in our national life. More than half a century ago, President Franklin Roosevelt reminded the American people that, ''Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them.'' I hope on this Memorial Day 2000, we as a nation, and each of us as individuals, will take to heart President Roosevelt's reminder that it is the sacred duty and great privilege of the living to honor and remember those who have died to protect the American ideals of freedom, democracy, and liberty. The men and women who have died in service to America and to all of us deserve no less.

MARTHA MATILDA HARPER'S BUSINESS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I speak in honor of Small Business Week. As we salute the entrepreneurial engine of our country, it is my distinct privilege to inform you that I represent the district where modern franchising was first conceived in Rochester, NY.

In 1888, Martha Matilda Harper, an impoverished Canadian immigrant who came to the United States to change her destiny, developed a new business model to share the economic opportunity of business ownership with former servant women, her working-class sisters. She demonstrated how to use business for social change. Ultimately, Harper had over 500 healthy hair and skin care salons throughout the world, delighting world leaders, including our presidents, first ladies, suffragists, and socialites. President Woodrow Wilson went for nightly scalp massages in the Harper Paris salon to relax his tired nerves, while he was negotiating the Treaty of Versailles.

As we go forth in the new millennium, I hope we remember to credit the early innovators in our country, especially when they were poor women such as Martha Matilda Harper who changed the face of our business models. It is particularly fitting that May 26th in Rochester, NY, is being declared Martha Matilda Harper Day as a new museum exhibit and book reveal the extraordinary feats and principles of this remarkable woman. May her wisdom and leadership guide us as we compete in our global economy.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 2000

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to recognizing, as normal, China's persistent violations of fundamental human rights, labor rights, reproductive rights, religious freedom, political rights, social and economic rights, as well as their export of sophisticated and destabilizing weapons, and their overt threats to Taiwan, by granting them Permanent Normal Trade Relations.

To be sure, some people will benefit from granting PNTR to China. If you can shut down your production lines in the United States, turn out your employees, and move your production to China where you can pay workers 25 cents an hour in sweatshop conditions—and have no moral qualms about that—then this deal can be a sweet one, indeed. But I thought the United States was supposed to stand for more than just making a quick buck.

I thought the United States was supposed to stand for what is good in the world.

It used to be that we did stand for good in the world. And because of that, we gained the respect and the moral integrity to make our word prevail throughout the world. Indeed, our power and authority went well beyond our ability to rattle sabers and exercise gunboat diplomacy. But it is obvious now to me, that by negotiating agreements like this that are devoid of moral content, my country has completely abdicated its professed concern for human rights.

My vote against PNTR is not a vote against trade. However, my vote against PNTR is a vote against the terms of trade that are being employed today by U.S. firms in China and elsewhere. By granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations, we now eschew one of our most important tools for examining the human rights practices of China. Unfortunately, the human rights record of China will likely get worse before it gets better. And the presence of U.S. corporations has not had and will not have a positive impact on the human rights record of China or on workers' rights.

Each year, the State Department submits to the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, where I serve as Ranking Democrat, its Country Reports on Human Rights. This is our government's formal assessment of basic human rights practices around the world. The record is clear. China's human rights record has markedly deteriorated as we have expanded trade. In fact, this year, my friend and Chairman of the Subcommittee, Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I had to hold two hearings on the State Departments annual human rights report—one for China, and one for every other nation in the world because China's record is so deplorable and is getting worse.

But after a historic look at rhetoric versus reality, that should not surprise us. After all, we had robust trade with the Nazis before World War II, extensive trade with Iraq just prior to Operation Desert Shield and we maintained an extensive trading relationship with South Africa during the dark years of apartheid.

In fact it was the people of this country—not the corporations—that put South Africa's human rights record on the national agenda. By focusing on South Africa, the people demanded the opposite of normal trade relations—an embargo! U.S. corporations had nothing to do with changing South Africa's internal policy toward its black majority nor U.S. policy of supporting the racist apartheid regime in South Africa. The U.S. corporate community, in fact, protested the embargo and some never abided by it. If we had waited for U.S. corporations to export democracy, Nelson Mandela would still be on Robben Island. On this issue, the people were heard over the high-priced lobbyists in Washington, DC.

And that is what now scares the high-priced lobbyists in Washington.

The way to keep China's human rights record on the national agenda is through our annual NTR review. That is one way that human rights activists in China and in the United States can inform the public of China's human rights record. The fancy lobbyists have squelched that now, so that there is no possibility of the American people becoming informed of what is happening in China, thereby thwarting the kind of action against China that was done against the racists in South Africa.

America's right to know has been severely damaged as a result of this vote.

Freedom, equality, human dignity, and human rights are not for sale. And that's one reason why I chose to vote against this tremendous human rights give-away.

Many proponents of PNTR, including Governor George Bush, say that ''Trade is the way to export freedom.'' A recent study entitled, ''Dollars and Democracy'' shows the post-Cold War decline of US trade and investment in developing democracies. In other words, US corporations are running away from the countries that are struggling to institute democracy—the countries we say we do like—

and are flocking to the authoritarian regimes around the world—the kinds of regimes we say are not good. More to the point, if given a choice between an emerging democracy and an authoritarian regime then US corporations take US taxpayer subsidies and choose the regimes that don't respect human rights, worker rights, or the environment.

For example, Charles Kernaghan in ''Made in China'' states that at one of the factories where Kathi Lee handbags are being made for Wal-Mart, the workers are forced ''to work 12 to 14 hours a day, seven days a week, with only one day off a month, while earning an average wage of 3 cents an hour. However, even after months of work, 46 percent of the workers surveyed earned nothing at all—in fact, they owed money to the company.''

Companies are allowed to get away with this kind of worker treatment in authoritarian regimes, not democracies. Furthermore, democracies tend to be more transparent and less corrupt. Yet US private investment currently favors the authoritarian over the democratic.

Supporters of PNTR dribble on about the need of engagement to facilitate a ''movement'' toward democracy. Yet the facts are that US corporations are leaving democracies at an unprecedented rate. US taxpayers subsidize this new ''corporate flight.'' And unfortunately, one need only look at Chevron Corporation and Occidental Petroleum Company to see examples of just the kind of ''movement'' that we ought not want to export. In fact, Chevron is in federal court today for aiding and abetting in the murder of Nigerian citizens demonstrating to protect their environment against Chevron's wanton pollution of their indigenous lands. Occidental Petroleum seems to be on the same path as Chevron, willing to run over Colombia's fledgling democracy in order to despoil the sacred lands of the Uwa people. The U'wa have vowed to die before Occidental is allowed on their land. None of this bodes well for anyone involved—except the stockholders, perhaps, of both Chevron and Occidental. And in China, workers who protest their conditions are fired or could face prison for life!

Americans who buy Huffy bicycles, Alpine car stereos, RCA TV's, or Timberland, Keds, Fubu and Nike shoes or Spiegel clothing should have a right to know the conditions under which those items are made. American workers who used to make those items and who are now struggling to find their place in the new economy, certainly should have a right to know why their jobs ''fled'' to China.

Despite the rhetoric, the vote on China PNTR will not protect the US worker, nor will it protect the Chinese worker. There is a need for something more. That is why I will soon be introducing the Corporate Code of Conduct Act. This bill will establish minimum human rights, labor rights, and environmental protection guidelines based on US and internationally recognized standards. This legislation will allow us all to put our money where our professed values are: fair trade, democracy, respect for workers, sensible environmental standards, and no child labor.

I believe that our corporations can export freedom, prosperity, equality, and justice; and our bill, the Corporate Code of Conduct Act, will ensure that they do.

THE WATER POLLUTION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000 (H.R. 4502)

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman and Ranking member of the House Committee on Agriculture, we are pleased to introduce the Water Pollution Program Improvement Act of 2000 on behalf of farmers, ranchers, woodland owners, local governments and states throughout America.

In August of 1999, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed two changes to the regulations governing the implementation of the Clean Water Act which, if finalized, would fundamentally alter the agency's role in the management of nonpoint sources of pollution. While we agree with the EPA's stated intent of improving the quality of our nation's waters, we strongly oppose both the substance of these rules and the accelerated process employed by the EPA to bring them to finality. Our bill is designed to address these two concerns directly.

Our criticisms of EPA's proposed rules generally fall into two categories: (1) lack of authority and (2) lack of information.

LACK OF AUTHORITY

Congress has clearly identified the responsibilities of the federal government and the states for maintaining the quality of our nation's waters. When Congress enacted the Clean Water Act in 1972, the primary emphasis of that legislation was to address point source pollution discharges. Congress at that time established a clear role for the Federal Government in the regulation of point source pollution through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination (NPDES) program.

Congress was also careful to define the point sources of pollution that would be subject to the NPDES program. This definition specifically excluded agricultural storm water discharge from the point source designation, thereby placing discharges from farming, ranching and silviculture operations outside of the reach of the federal permitting program.

In 1987 Congress amended the Clean Water Act to establish a framework within which states could carry out their responsibility to manage nonpoint sources of pollution. It was the intent of Congress at that time to preserve the distinctions between point and nonpoint sources of pollution established in the 1972 Act so that there would be no ambiguity with regard to the role of the state in relation to the federal government.

At no time has Congress granted the federal government an affirmative regulatory role in the management of nonpoint sources of pollution. Neither has Congress granted the EPA the authority to unilaterally change the clear distinctions between point and nonpoint sources of pollution currently established in law.

Upon review of the draft rules proposed by the EPA, it is our view that the agency's proposal exceeds the authority provided by the 1972 Act and the 1987 amendments both in terms of the new regulatory role assumed by the EPA and the designation of silvicultural activities as point sources of pollution. We further believe that while the joint statement issued by the EPA and USDA on May 1, 2000 partially addresses concerns raised by Congress and affected stakeholders regarding the EPA's authority, it does little to overcome this fundamental problem.

LACK OF INFORMATION

Over the last 28 years, the Federal government and the states have placed great emphasis on reducing pollution levels from point sources. Both have made significant investments in technologies and scientific methods to measure and control pollution discharges. These investments have paid off as we have seen dramatic decreases in point source pollution over the last two decades.

Recently, both the Federal government and the states have begun to place increasing emphasis on the improvement of programs to reduce pollution from nonpoint sources. Understandably, because of the priority emphasis placed on point sources over the years, the technology and data needed to achieve measurable large-scale reductions on nonpoint source pollution are not yet fully developed.

States, local governments, businesses and landowners are currently poised to voluntarily spend billions of dollars over the next 20 years in an earnest attempt to acquire this technology and data. In order to realize the optimum return on these investments, however, states, local governments and other affected stakeholders must be allowed to operate within the flexible framework established by the 1987 Clean Water Act amendments. This will preserve the ability of the states to develop innovated methods to gather the information upon which sound management objectives can be based and thereafter design programs carefully tailored to meet those objectives.

Unfortunately, EPA's proposed rules move in exactly the opposite direction. By establishing arbitrary deadlines for completing TMDLs, threatening to unilaterally establish TMDLs and load allocations, and imposing mandatory guidelines for best management practices, EPA will force states to act before they have the data needed to act intelligently. In fact, the General Accounting Office has found that few states have the majority of the data needed to comply with the onerous requirements outlined in the EPA's proposed rules. Forcing states to comply with the new regulatory framework required by the EPA at this stage of the process will waste time and money and result in confusion rather than better water quality.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the bill we are introducing today is to address the two concerns raised previously, namely, that the EPA lacks both the authority and the information to proceed with the agency's proposed rules.

Our legislation commissions an independent study of the scientific methodologies, programs, and costs associated with the development and implementation of TMDLs. We intend this independent review to provide the EPA, the Secretary of Agriculture and the states a valuable tool with which to develop sound policies for the management of nonpoint sources of pollution. This approach will help remedy the current problems associated with identifying impaired water bodies and establishing TMDL allocations based on anecdotal and otherwise unverifiable data. It