

I understand that elephants, like the whales found off the coast of Massachusetts, are able to communicate over long distances by making deep rumbling sounds that humans cannot hear. If we could hear them, I am sure the elephants would be thanking Mr. BEILENSEN for his extraordinary work on their behalf.

I wish we could be as optimistic about the future of the other species these laws are designed to protect. Due to the continuing demand for rhino horns and tiger bones in traditional Asian medicines, and the deplorable illegal trade in tiger skins, these extraordinary creatures may be gone from the face of the Earth by the time the Democrats regain control of this Congress. There is some hope, however, for both the rhinos and tigers and the Democrats.

The battle to save these species from extinction is far from over, but at least the battle is joined. We must continue to do all we can through international cooperation and environmental education to ensure that rhinos, tigers, and elephants still exist for future generations.

We all know that extinction, like politics, is forever. It is a very special privilege to recognize TONY, whose loss will be immense to this institution and to the country, to say nothing of the heffalumps.

INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE WOMEN'S PENSIONS PROTECTION ACT

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are here this morning to announce the introduction of the comprehensive women's pension bill of 1996.

While Republicans spent the 104th Congress trying to deny working American families \$40 billion of their hard earned pension money by allowing employers to raid pension plans, Democrats beat back these attempts and worked to ensure that working Americans, particularly women, get the benefits to which they are entitled.

For instance, President Clinton recently signed into law legislation I have championed since 1986 which reduces the vesting period—the period you must work before become entitled to a pension—from 10 to 5 years for multiemployer plans. The moment President Clinton put his signature on the bill, 1 million Americans became entitled to a pension. But there is much more work to be done, particularly for the women of America.

For instance, less than one-third of all women retirees over age 55 receive pension benefits compared to 55 percent of male retirees. Yet the typical American woman who retires can expect to live approximately 19 years. Sadly, over one-third of elderly women living alone live below the poverty line and three-fifths live within 150 percent of the poverty line. Women's pension benefits depend on several factors including: participation in the work force, lifetime earnings relative to those of current or former husbands, and marital history.

There has been a long-term trend toward greater labor market participation by women. In 1940, only 28 percent of all women worked

and less than 15 percent of married women worked. By 1993, almost 60 percent of all women worked and married women were slightly more likely than other women to be working. The growth of women in the work force is even more pronounced for women in their prime earning years—ages 25 to 54. The labor force participation rate for these women increased from 42 percent in 1960 to 75 percent in 1993. For married women in this age bracket labor force participation increased from 35 percent in 1960 to 72 percent in 1993.

Not only are more women working, they are staying in the work force longer. For instance, 19 percent of married women with children under age 6 worked in 1960; by 1993, 60 percent of these women were in the work force. Similarly, 39 percent of married women with children between the ages of 6 and 17 were in the work force in 1960 and by 1993, fully 75 percent of these women were in the work force.

Women's median year-round, full-time covered earnings were a relatively constant 60 percent of men's earnings until about 1980. Since that time, women's earnings have risen to roughly 70 percent of men's. This increase will, in time, increase pension benefits for women although this change will be slow because benefits are based on average earnings over a lifetime.

A woman's marital status at retirement is also a critical factor in determining benefits. The Social Security Administration projects that the proportion of women aged 65 to 69 who are married will remain relatively constant over the next 25 years, and that the proportion who are divorced will more than double over this period. There are tremendous inequities in the law with respect to the pension of a widow or divorced spouse. For instance, only about 54 percent of married private pension plan recipients have selected a joint and survivor option, which, in the event of their death, will continue to provide benefits to their spouse.

The face of women in America today has changed; it's time our pension laws recognize those changes. The bill before us today does just that. A number of us have been active in this area. We have been successful in getting small pieces enacted. And today, we pledge to work together in the next Congress to update our pension laws for the women of America.

SOUND ADVICE ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as we consider our future trade relations with China, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention to an excellent speech on the issue by former Secretary of Commerce Barbara Hackman Franklin.

Secretary Franklin not only has long experience in United States trade policy, but she also has particular expertise in United States-Chinese relations. That is why the Heritage Foundation asked her to make a special address on this subject.

In her remarks, Ms. Franklin emphasized that our relationship with China has come to a critical point. She urged us to consider the

long term implications of our annual fight over MFN. Further, Ms. Franklin described the significant changes occurring in China and the impact of trade investment on those changes.

As Ms. Franklin pointed out, China is rapidly becoming a global economic power, making it crucial that the United States have a consistent, long-range strategy for stable, constructive relations.

Barbara Franklin has made a major contribution to a better understanding of our relationship with China as well as the implications of MFN for our national interest. I am including a summary of her speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge my colleagues to read it carefully.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS GIVEN BY THE HONORABLE BARBARA HACKMAN FRANKLIN—“CHINA: FRIEND OR ENEMY?”

(Prepared by the staff of the Committee on International Relations)

The bilateral relationship between the U.S. and China is one of the most important in the world today. We have come to a critical point, where a better understanding between the two countries has become crucial for a stable and predictable relationship for the future.

Change in China is occurring at a tremendous rate and the result of China's transition can affect the U.S. for many reasons. China has the largest population and standing army in the world. It also is strategically positioned in the center of Asia and is a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, giving China the power to veto decisions in the U.N.

China's growing economic clout is significant for the U.S. as well. Currently, China is rated as the third largest economy in the world, behind Japan and the U.S., and predictions of China's future economic growth show that within the next 15 years it has the potential of becoming the world's largest economy. This has become important for the U.S. because China is the largest market in the world for aircraft, telephones, construction equipment, agriculture products, and increasingly for consumer goods. We can see that China is a market for many of the products sold by the U.S. and, more importantly, the figures show that the demand in China continues to grow rapidly.

At the same time, we cannot ignore the vital concerns many people have brought up about the problems with human rights abuses, nuclear proliferation, and protection of intellectual property rights in China. Our increasing trade deficit has also caused a great deal of anxiety in the U.S., along with the question of both Taiwan and Hong Kong and the intentions of China's military. Many goals are being set by the central government and provinces, ranging from expanding education to strengthening China's agriculture to meeting the basic needs of the Chinese people, to help alleviate the problems and issues that China faces.

Threatening to deny MFN status should not be used as a means of addressing these concerns. Congress should renew MFN for China. Denying MFN status to China or attaching unrelated conditions does not make any sense for many reasons. The economic consequences would be profound, as denial of MFN would hinder trade and increase tariffs and costs for U.S. companies doing business in China. A negative message to the Asia-Pacific region would also result, where there is already concern about whether the U.S. is going to withdraw. Denying MFN would also harm the economies of Taiwan and Hong Kong and, as previously stated, would not correct or erase any of the concerns we have with China. Furthermore, the time has come

to make MFN for China permanent as our strategic and economic relationship with China is too important to continue this heated and controversial debate every year.

It is also important to note that, currently, the U.S.-China relationship is at one of its all-time lowest points. It is characterized by distrust and misunderstanding, stemming in large part from the inconsistent actions of the Clinton Administration in its policies toward China. Many in China's government have interpreted our mixed messages as a policy of "containment", which has led to feelings of resentment against the U.S., as well as confusion on the part of the Chinese about what we really mean. We need a strategic framework for our relationship. Clear objectives and expectations for our relationship must be articulated to the Chinese. Dialogues at the highest levels should be used as means by which we can express and push for the goals we have set to achieve. Areas of common interest and agreement, such as commercial relations, provide a good foundation from which we can build.

The U.S. should actively encourage China's economic reform process as well as that country's integration into the world community. The U.S. should help to bring China into the WTO on acceptable terms; that way we can pursue our trade agenda multilaterally as well as bilaterally. The U.S. needs to focus on consistent actions that courage the Chinese to move forward instead of publicly shouting at them, as the Clinton Administration has been doing. We need to stay engaged with China, to use our best diplomatic judgment and skill, to disagree and be tough-minded when we must, while keeping our eye on the goal of achieving a working relationship.

The attitude of the U.S. toward China and the tone of the U.S.-China government relationship can have an influence on which way things go. But using trade as a weapon to address the concerns will not eliminate the problems and may only punish U.S. exports more than they hurt China. Therefore, we must look at the long term, instead of being short sighted, and adopt a consistent policy towards China that intelligibly addresses our concerns and objectives. The future relationship is at hand and if we continue our current, inconsistent approach to China, there is no telling what will result. This is a gamble the U.S. and the world cannot afford to take.

LIVEMORE PUBLIC LIBRARY TURNS 100

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1896, the Wright Brothers had yet to fly, Henry Ford's mass production line had not yet opened, and Dwight Eisenhower was still a boy on the Kansas prairie. Yet the public-spirited citizens of Livermore, CA were already showing their commitment to building a strong community as they opened the Livermore Public Library.

For 10 decades, the Livermore Library has opened the doors of learning to generations of East Bay residents. The library has survived a Depression, two World Wars, and great social changes. Whatever was occurring in the world outside, the walls of the library were witnessing the quiet, steady flow of knowledge, and

the library's resources were helping prepare people of all ages to fulfill their chosen tasks and pursue their personal interests.

Thanks belong to the people of Livermore for all they have done to continue this tradition to the present day. I applaud their commitment to learning, to public service, and to education, and wish them all the best as they celebrate this unique event in the history of the Livermore community.

A TRIBUTE TO EDWARD LENZ

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, too often we forget here in Washington that a pyramid rests on its broad base, not its pinnacle. In like manner, our political system rests not on Congressmen but on those who devote their time to local government: a lot of headaches and little pay.

Ed Lenz was a solid man, a good man, one of those foundation stones of America's democratic system. He shouldered the burden of public service without complaint, and served his family, his community, and his God. Would that we all have the same spirit of public service that Ed did.

Ed passed away after a lifetime of service. He was a Korean war veteran, serving in a too often ignored war in the Army.

He then studied electrical engineering, and worked for General Electric in locomotive testing for 27 years.

Ed was a husband and a father, and was always there for his family and community.

That is why he was a Republican committeeman, a member of the Wesleyville Planning Commission, and a Wesleyville councilman.

Wesleyville is going to miss Ed. In these days of cheap celebrity, I mention Ed because he was a good man, and I think such men should be remembered.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BIOMEDICAL IMAGING ESTABLISHMENT ACT

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 26, 1996

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging Establishment Act of behalf of myself and my colleagues Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

As millions of Americans know from personal experience, new developments in medical imaging have revolutionized patient care in the past quarter century. The field is no longer limited to x-rays. Sophisticated new technologies such as computed tomography [CT], magnetic resonance imaging [MRI], positron emission tomography [PET], and ultrasound allow physicians to diagnose and treat disease in ways that would have seemed impossible just a generation ago.

Mammography, for example, has improved the odds enormously for patients through early detection. And now, image-based biopsy methods have made it possible to diagnose many suspicious lumps in women without resorting to expensive and painful surgery.

For children, imaging has meant a dramatic reduction in the need for surgery. In the past, for example, a child brought into a hospital after an automobile accident would often undergo exploratory surgery if internal injuries were suspected. Today, a CT scan immediately after admission to the emergency room often eliminates the need for surgery at all. This not only avoids an expensive and potentially dangerous procedure; it also eliminates unnecessary pain and lengthy recovery periods.

The achievements of medical imaging are remarkable. And the potential for the future is equally dramatic. Imaging research promises breakthroughs in the early detection of such diseases as prostate and colon cancer, as well as the identification of individuals at risk for Alzheimer's disease.

Imaging research is also developing the foundation for the surgical techniques of the 21st century. Virtual reality neurosurgery, robotic surgery, and a whole array of image-guided procedures are revolutionizing surgical practice.

Developments in imaging are also making it possible to deliver better medical services to patients in rural regions and other underserved areas. Through teleradiology, experts in hospitals hundreds or even thousands of miles from patients can read images and make accurate diagnoses.

Americans can reap impressive benefits from future innovations in imaging. But these developments could be delayed significantly, or even lost, if we do not make a renewed commitment to image researching at the National Institutes of Health. The NIH is the premier biomedical institution in the world, but it is not organized to optimize research in this crucial field. The NIH is organized in Institutes, to support research related to specific diseases or body organ systems.

Imaging, however, is not specific to any one disease or organ. It has applications in virtually every area. For that reason, imaging research is conducted at most of the Institutes at NIH, but it is not a priority at any Institute. Instead, it is dispersed throughout the Institutes, producing uncoordinated decisionmaking and resource allocation.

The same is true on a larger scale beyond the NIH. A number of Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, NASA, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and the intelligence agencies support imaging research programs. There is, however, no central coordination or direction for this research.

We can fix this problem. We can provide the needed oversight and direction for imaging research at NIH and throughout the Federal Government. We can ensure that taxpayer dollars expended on imaging research produce a greater return. And we can do all of this without additional spending.

The bill we are introducing today creates an organization at NIH to oversee and direct imaging research. But it does not add further layers of bureaucracy. On the contrary, the bill allows the Director of NIH to use existing administrative structures, existing personnel, and existing facilities for the new Institute.