

will retain the ability of Congress to examine China's willingness and ability to keep its commitments. It will give China incentive to improve its record with regard to workers' rights and human rights and give it an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

## A RECORD OF NONCOMPLIANCE

To some degree, the Chinese government has avoided full compliance with many of the trade agreements it has made with the United States. While our trade deficit with China continues to grow, China has broken its agreements with us on opening markets, stopping the piracy of intellectual property, and ending the export of goods produced in the forced labor camps. The statements of China's negotiators on PNTR lead me to believe that we cannot count on a total, good-faith compliance with this agreement, either.

This pattern of non-compliance, or of only partial compliance, bolsters significantly the argument against PNTR and in favor of the annual renewals that have been granted in the past. Just as ending our trade relationship with China altogether would be a foolish and self-destructive for the United States, losing our annual review and any subsequent leverage to move

In any number of areas—agricultural commodities, meat and poultry, telecommunications, petroleum, insurance-related services, and others—American interests are best served when we can revisit compliance issues regularly. With PNTR, our opportunities to monitor and influence compliance are severely limited, if not eliminated, while an annual review will retain the ability of Congress to examine China's willingness and ability to keep its commitments.

## CONCLUSION

A "no" vote on PNTR will not mean an end to America's trade relationship with China. The U.S. and China will continue to have a binding trade relationship under international law, governed by the 1979 trade agreement between our two countries and several subsequent bilateral deals. The "most favored nation" provisions of those agreements require that China afford to the United States any trade and non-trade economic benefits that China grants to our competitors. It is true that the U.S. would not be able to file complaints against China through the WTO dispute resolution process. However, we will retain the right to use our own laws to sanction China—by withholding or limiting access to the U.S. market—for unfair trade practices.

Furthermore, if the U.S. and China are not tied through the WTO, we will be able to use our trade laws to redress abuses of human rights and worker rights. The U.S. would be prohibited from taking such actions if China and the U.S. have a WTO relationship. So China's lack of PNTR status allows us annual reviews of China's progress, thus giving China an incentive to improve its record with regard to workers' rights and human rights and give that nation an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

There is no doubt in my mind that trade is the key to the future. Opening markets benefit everyone—the U.S. gains new destinations to export goods and China gains investment from foreign companies. In my opinion, the question this PNTR vote poses is not on the merits of free trade but rather whether the U.S. should

relinquish our influence on trade with China permanently. International trade—and the benefits it affords—are a fact. Likewise, it should also not be disputed as to whether the United States should attempt to influence Chinese behavior in areas of human and workers' rights, weapons proliferation and compliance with international commitments. Clearly we should. Thus, my concern lies with whether we should take China off the one-year renewal process. Given current conditions in China and recent actions by the Chinese government, I am not convinced that relinquishing this leveraging tool is in our best national interest at this time.

It is for all of these reasons that I must oppose permanent normal trade relations at this time. I am not convinced that it is in the best interest of Tennesseans and our country to reward China with unconditional permanent normal trade relations when it is clear they do not meet our standards for human and worker rights and could threaten our national security. Clearly trade must continue and we must pledge ourselves to work with the Chinese reformers to move their country towards free market democracy. However, until significant improvements are made in these areas, I cannot in good faith vote to grant PNTR.

I look forward to the day when China fully joins the international community in a commitment to democratic values, human rights, and trade that is truly free and fair. Until that time, we have a duty to use whatever tools we have available to us to influence China to take that path. My vote against PNTR for China is one such tool, and I utilize it in good conscience and with a conviction that it will benefit both the Chinese and American people.

---

 TRIBUTE TO THE PARTICIPANTS  
OF THE S.P.H.E.R.E.S. PROJECT

---

**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2000*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend John Link, Amy Rahe, Carmen Reiner, and Adam Wieties. These four middle school students from Carlinville Middle School in Carlinville, IL, are tackling tough community issues as participants in the Bayer/NSF Award for Community Innovation.

Their project is Saving Prairies and Helping Environmental Regions Expand Successfully—S.P.H.E.R.E.S. Through this project they have successfully strengthened local support to create a preserve where native prairie grasses and indigenous creatures could flourish and students could study and experience the prairie habitat.

I want to take this opportunity to thank these students who at such a young age have made it their responsibility to preserve our environment. I am proud of them and look forward to all else they may accomplish.

IN HONOR OF HELEN STEINEL'S  
RETIREMENT AFTER 30 YEARS  
IN EDUCATION

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2000*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Helen Steinel on her retirement after 30 years in education.

Helen Steinel began her illustrious career in education as a teacher. She taught at Holy Family, St. Joseph's, St. Joseph and Michael, and Mother Seton elementary schools, all schools in Union City, NJ. For the last several years, Helen has been the principal of Mother Seton School, where she is a mentor to her faculty, and where she has educated teachers as well as children in her work with student teachers.

For 30 years, Helen has dedicated herself to the education of children, and for 30 years, she has touched the lives of students and teachers in a way that her years of dedication cannot measure. Helen understands and imparts to others the knowledge that education is a profound tool for understanding the world and a necessary instrument in realizing one's full potential as a human being.

It is said that teaching another something of value takes compassion, understanding, and patience; and absent these virtues, the simple process of imparting knowledge can become strained and cumbersome, leaving both teacher and pupil estranged, unable to truly learn from each other. In honoring Helen today, I honor the virtues that allow teachers to become great educators.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me as I honor Helen Steinel, a great woman and educator I respect and admire.

---

 TRIBUTE TO AKIRA INOUE
**HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 8, 2000*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, Each year, the Guam Chamber of Commerce selects the "Small Business Person of the Year" from a pool of individuals and business partners who either own and operate or bear principal responsibility for small business establishments on Guam. The chamber takes into account staying power, sales growth, growth in payroll, innovativeness in product or service, response to adversity, and civic contributions. This year the honor was bestowed upon local businessman, Akira Inoue.

Having held assignments in Australia, New Guinea, Saipan and other neighboring islands, Akira chose to settle on Guam, an island he deemed to be the ideal hub for Japanese oriented businesses. On September 1, 1968, he established Nanbo Guam, Ltd. Initially engaged in the importation and wholesale of general merchandise from Japan, Nanbo Guam started underwriting insurance in June of 1969.

With neither experience nor training in the insurance business, Akira assumed the function of general agent for The Tokio Marine and Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., of Japan. The company enjoyed a steady growth and, with it, the