

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 2000

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again introduce a resolution for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to hold its race along Constitution Avenue. This bill will permit the 59th running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, which is to take place on the Capitol Grounds on Saturday, June 24th, 2000.

This resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby in complete compliance with rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

In the past, the full House has supported this resolution once reported favorably by the full Transportation Committee. I ask for my colleagues to join with me, and Representatives ALBERT WYNN, CONNIE MORELLA, JIM MORAN, and TOM DAVIS, in supporting this resolution.

From 1992 to 1999, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby welcomed over 40 contestants which made the Washington, DC race one of the largest in the country. Participants range from ages 9 to 16 and hail from communities in Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia. The winners of this local event will represent the Washington Metropolitan Area in the National Race, which will be held in Akron, Ohio on July 22, 2000.

The Soap Box Derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills such as engineering and aerodynamics. Furthermore, the Derby promotes team work, a strong sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibility. These are positive attributes that we should encourage children to carry into adulthood.

The young people involved spend months preparing for this race, and the day that they complete it makes it all the more worthwhile.

FORMER UAW PRESIDENT UNDERSTANDS THAT PNTR FOR CHINA IS IN AMERICA'S NATIONAL INTEREST

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on providing China with Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status conditioned on China's entry into the World Trade

Organization (WTO) intensifies, I recommend to my colleagues and submit for the RECORD the following commentary written by Leonard Woodcock in the Los Angeles Times on March 9, 2000. A key lieutenant in the 1930's drive to unionize the U.S. auto industry, Mr. Woodcock rose in the union ranks to become president of the United Auto Workers union from 1971–1977. Later that decade he served as the United States Ambassador to China. Indeed, Mr. Woodcock is uniquely qualified to judge from a labor perspective the merits and impact of providing China with PNTR in the context of the United States-China WTO bilateral accession agreement. He supports the agreement and PNTR status for China. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why other labor leaders and their Democratic supporters in Congress cannot be as supportive as is the former president of the United Auto Workers, Leonard Woodcock.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 9, 2000]

EVOLUTION DOESN'T OCCUR OVERNIGHT

WTO AGREEMENT: ORGANIZED LABOR SHOULD SUPPORT IT. IT'S IN BOTH U.S. AND CHINESE INTERESTS

(By Leonard Woodcock)

The recent U.S.–China World Trade Organization bilateral accession agreement appears to be good for workers in both countries. I was privileged, as U.S. ambassador to China, to sign the 1979 trade agreement that provided for most-favored-nation trade status to China and have, as a private citizen, been involved with this issue for many years.

American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the U.S. The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal. The agreement expands American jobs. And while China already enjoys WTO-based access to our economy, this agreement will open China's economy to unprecedented levels of American exports, many of which are high-quality goods produced by high-paying jobs.

There is reason to fear unfair trade practices. Yet this agreement actually provides better protections than our existing laws allow. It stipulates 12 years of protections against market surges and provides unusually strong anti-dumping laws—which aim to counter unfairly priced imports—for 15 years.

I have, therefore, been startled by organized labor's vociferous negative reaction to this agreement. The reality is that the U.S. as a whole benefits mightily from this historic accord. The AFL–CIO argues that nothing in this agreement demands that free trade unions be formed in China. Yet the WTO does not require this of any of its 136 member countries, and the WTO is the wrong instrument to use to achieve unionization.

We should, instead, be asking a more important question: Are Chinese workers better off with or without this agreement? The answer is that this agreement, in a variety of ways, will be enormously beneficial to Chinese workers.

On a subtle level, the changes the agreement requires of China's economic system will work in favor of investment by Western firms and take away some of the key advan-

tages Asian firms now enjoy in China. Every survey has demonstrated that working conditions and environmental standards in plants run by West European and North American firms are usually better than those in Asian and in indigenous Chinese firms.

The greater foreign presence also will expose Chinese workers to more ideas about organization and rights. That is perhaps one reason why almost every Chinese political dissident who has spoken out on this issue has called the U.S.–China WTO agreement good news for freedom in China.

The trade deficit with China is a troublesome one to the labor movement. We need to put it in perspective in two ways. First, if we were to block access of goods from China to the U.S., this would not increase American jobs. That is because the Chinese exports—mostly toys, tools, apparel, cheap electronics, etc.—would be produced in other low-wage countries, not in the U.S. Yet if China stopped buying from us, we would lose about 400,000 jobs, mostly high-wage.

Second, a large portion of exports from "China" are goods produced in the main in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The major components are then shipped to China for final assembly and packaging, but the entire cost of the item (often only 15% of which was contributed in China) is attributed to China's export ledger. Exports to the U.S. from Hong Kong and Taiwan have declined over the past decade almost as fast as imports from China have increased. Yet the companies making the profits are in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and they will simply shift their operations to Vietnam or elsewhere if we close down exports from China.

Americans are broadly concerned about the rights and quality of life of Chinese citizens. My perspective on this serious issue is influenced by my experience in the U.S. In my lifetime, women were not allowed the vote, and labor was not allowed to organize. And, in my lifetime, although the law did not permit lynching, it was protected and carried out by legal officeholders. As time passed, we made progress, and I doubt if lectures or threats from foreigners would have moved things faster.

Democracy, including rights for workers, is an evolutionary process. Isolation and containment will not promote improved rights for a people. Rather, working together and from within a society will, over time, promote improved conditions. The U.S.–China WTO agreement will speed up the evolutionary process in China. American labor should support it because it is in our interests, and it is the interests of Chinese workers too.

PROFESSOR HELLE PORS DAM: A DISTINCTIVE INSIGHT ON AMERICAN CULTURE AND THE LAW

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to take notice of the work of a talented Danish scholar, Professor Helle

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.