

the upcoming challenges and opportunities of the G8 Summit in Denver. Anticipating the economic boost from this week's G8 Summit, Denver area merchants hope to rake in big revenues from the thousands of visitors expected. Yet how well Colorado fulfills its role as gracious host will be but one measure of the State's achievement during the historic event.

More important than the short-term economic surge associated with the summit, success in advancing the Nation's trade objectives will have a far greater impact on Colorado's long-term economy and job growth. Among the leaders assembled, the most pivotal exchange to watch is the one between President Clinton and Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto.

Hashimoto's visit will highlight the close alliance the United States and Japan have established throughout the cold war years, and maintain today. However, while United States interests remain tightly linked with those of Japan on many fronts, such as containment of North Korea, the Hashimoto visit may serve as a springboard for talks on other issues that divide us.

Despite the close ties we have forged, the bilateral relationship between the United States and Japan has been marred by a series of ongoing trade disputes that are of major concern to United States interest—especially the interests of Colorado.

Specifically, the United States Trade Representative is challenging 30 years of Japan's Government-supported market barriers that have prevented, and continue to prevent international competitors from gaining fair access to the Japanese market for consumer film and paper products. The massive array of evidence reveals for the first time, an elaborate system designed to exclude foreign competitors from Japanese markets.

So what does film and paper have to do with Colorado? In a word, Kodak. Eastman Kodak Co. employs over 2,700 people in northern Colorado. Their photographic products are sold all over the world.

Much of what Kodak sells overseas is manufactured at their plant in Windsor, CO. where Kodak exports color paper and medical x-ray film directly to Japan. Expanding this market share would certainly create more jobs in Colorado and expand economic prosperity.

One year ago, the United States Government determined that Japan has engaged in unreasonable trade practices in the lucrative market. Rather than retaliating directly, the United States filed a case with the newly formed World Trade Organization [WTO]. The case is regarded as the most comprehensive well-documented trade case in history—the resolution of which could substantially change the way America does business with Japan. The case is expected to be decided in October, this year.

For those of us who are WTO skeptics, the episode is the first real test of the panel's capacity to address structural and access barriers. The precedent that could be set might have a profound impact on literally hundreds of Colorado-based exporters seeking broader markets in Japan.

George M.C. Fisher, Kodak CEO expressed optimism about the case against Japanese protectionism. "We believe that the WTO, upon examination of the evidence, will conclude that the laws and measures exacted by

the Government of Japan to restrict foreign competition in its consumer photographic produce market, are inconsistent with the country's international obligations under the GATT," he said. "The ramifications of this historic case are potentially of landmark proportions."

Still, it is unfortunate that Kodak must go to such exhausting lengths to gain fair market access in Japan. An assertive United States President would have dealt more firmly with Japan rather than defer the Kodak case to the WTO as Clinton chose to do.

If Prime Minister Hashimoto is any less stubborn, the G8 meeting right here in Colorado might prove to be the perfect place to announce the loosening of trade restrictions, to allow greater competition in the Japanese market, to allow Japanese consumers the advantage of lower prices, and to shore up the otherwise good relationship between the United States and Japan. It would be a Kodak moment, that all of Colorado could take to the bank.

FREEDOM FOR ALL

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1997

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is an alarming trend that has occurred the past several months, led by some social conservative organizations in Washington who have called for the revocation of China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status. They argue we should revoke this status, which is simply normal trade relations between countries, to retaliate against the Chinese Government for interfering with the practice of religion.

I, too, am very concerned about the persecution of anyone who practices religion in China. It is for this very reason that I have the firm conviction that MFN must be renewed. In fact, missionaries in China, who are closest to the issue, say that MFN is essential for maintaining the positive work they do. As a conservative, as a Christian, and as the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade I am absolutely convinced that by bringing the influence of the outside world into China, free trade will create opportunities for freedom of religion to take root.

Trade has helped to expose millions of the Chinese people to values such as human rights and religious freedom by opening a door to the People's Republic of China. In the June 11, 1997, edition of the Wall Street Journal, Rev. Robert A. Sirico addressed many of these concerns and concluded that "Just as religious freedom offers the best hope for Christian social influence, economic freedom is the best hope for spreading that influence around the world." I applaud his thinking and submit his article into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to consider the points he raises here and to vote to renew China's MFN status.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 11, 1997]

CHINA AND THE TRADE WARRIORS

(By Robert A. Sirico)

Despite occasional tensions between social conservatives and economic conservatives, most social and cultural goals have an economic dimension about which the two camps

are generally in agreement. But now a leader of the socially conservative camp has proposed that there is an issue that pits morality and prosperity irreconcilably against one another—U.S. trade with China, a nation known for human-rights violations, and particularly for religious persecution.

Gary Bauer of the Family Research Council is demanding that the U.S. government wage economic war against China with sanctions, boycotts and embargoes. In his campaign for trade restrictions with China, Mr. Bauer and a few other conservative leaders are working hand in glove with labor unions and other left-liberal protectionists, normally die-hard opponents of the religious right.

BARRICADES HAVE COLLAPSED

The usual political barricades have collapsed as Mr. Bauer's comrades join forces to oppose congressional attempts to continue normal trading relations with China. In a recent letter, Mr. Bauer compares the urgency of imposing sanctions to issues such as ending slavery and defeating Hitler.

How restricting trade with China will help strengthen American families, faith and morality is unclear. What is clear is that Mr. Bauer finds China's treatment of Christians morally objectionable. I do, too. And he is to be commended for his efforts at raising the public's awareness of Chinese persecution. Christians are threatened, jailed, expelled and even killed in China. Whether this occurs more or less today than in decades past is in dispute. But one human-rights violation is one too many.

That's why I, along with many others, signed an open letter from the Family Research Council to Vice President Al Gore that appeared in major newspapers. It objected to Mr. Gore's failure to emphasize China's poor human-rights record during his March visit. The letter particularly highlighted China's vicious suppression of rights of Roman Catholics to worship in freedom. The letter said nothing about a broader trade agenda.

I would have signed a similar letter about the appalling treatment of Christians in Egypt (which receives U.S. aid), Saudi Arabia (which the U.S. has defended militarily) and Iraq (where a Kurdish convert to Christianity, Mansour Hussein Sifer, was recently martyred). Friends of freedom should oppose restrictions on worship and religious speech anywhere they may appear, including the U.S.

When I signed the letter on China, however, I did not know that it was a prologue to a full-blown political campaign that would seek to curtail commercial ties between China and the rest of the world. Mr. Bauer's position has evolved from a strong moral stand in favor of religious freedom to waging total trade war.

A charge often leveled against the Christian right is that it is not sensitive to the difference between urging certain moral ends and using government coercion to bring them about. It's usually a canard: In the case of the arts, for example, the religious right seeks not censorship but an end to taxpayer subsidies for blasphemy and obscenity. I regret having to say that this time, however, the Family Research Council has lived up to the stereotype. It is attempting to enlist government power, at the expense of everyone who benefits from U.S.-Chinese commercial relations, thus choosing an inappropriate means to achieve a moral end.

What's more, trade sanctions would be counterproductive. Sanctions won't bring freedom for religious expression in China. They won't end China's cruel policies limiting family size. They won't stop the horrific policy of forced abortions. They won't bring

democracy. They can only further isolate China and close off avenues for greater Western influence.

The growth of Western businesses in China, however, would dilute the power of China's communist rulers. As commercial networks develop, Chinese businesspeople are able to travel more freely, and Chinese believers have more disposable income with which to support evangelistic endeavors.

No one understands this better than evangelical missionaries currently working in China. Mr. Bauer's passionate campaign has elicited pleas from many of them for Congress not to cut off trade. Such an action would endanger their status there, and possibly lead China to revoke their visas. It would severely limit opportunities to bring in Bibles and other religious materials. These missionaries understand that commercial relations are a wonderfully liberating force that allow not only mutually beneficial trade but also cultural and religious exchanges. Why doesn't Mr. Bauer listen to those who know far more about China than Washington think tanks and labor unions do? "They may be too close to the situation," he answers, somewhat flippantly.

Until recently, trade warriors have cited the case of the U.S. Catholic bishops, who have opposed renewing normal trade status with China. At the same time, however, Hong Kong's official Catholic newspaper, the Sunday Examiner, reports new contacts between Beijing and Hong Kong's Catholic hierarchy. These contacts are a major step toward an official recognition of the Catholic Church on the mainland.

TO THE GOOD

This would all be to the good. Diplomacy and international trade strengthen people's loyalties to each other and weaken government power. Beijing has shown itself to be supremely interested in fostering prosperity at home. Christians must take advantage of this impulse, rather than recklessly treating China as a monster that must be slain.

This need not be an issue that divides social conservatives from economic conservatives. Economic prosperity through free trade is the most effective distributor of wealth and power, and trade with China is the surest way to break the gap of centralized political power. Religious conservatives should broaden their focus beyond purely social and cultural issues. Mr. Bauer and his supporters are right to decry the immoral treatment of believers in China. But allowing themselves to be used by protectionist and labor lobbies is an imprudent approach. Just as religious freedom offers the best hope for Christian social influence, economic freedom is the best hope for spreading that influence around the world.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF FREELY ELECTED HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased recently to participate in this year's meeting of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government in Atlanta, GA. This meeting dealt with a number of important issues facing the Western Hemisphere, but I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues on one issue the conference addressed: The importance of freedom of the press.

Freedom of speech and of the press is a basic American value. It is enshrined in the first amendment to our Constitution. As countries around the world struggle to achieve a transition to democracy, we must never forget the importance of this freedom. We must strive to protect and foster the rights of expression of peoples everywhere.

It was in this spirit that the council endorsed a declaration on press freedom that was adopted on March 11, 1994, at the Hemisphere Conference on Free Speech held at Chapultepec Castle in Mexico City.

Known as the Declaration of Chapultepec, it has been endorsed by news organizations and prominent leaders throughout the Western Hemisphere, including President Clinton.

The Declaration describes the importance of a free press in a free society, and lays down 10 principles for ensuring the continuance of press freedom. It is only when individuals take responsibility for protecting their liberties that we can all be assured of the continuation of the freedoms that we cherish.

I commend the Declaration to my colleagues and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point:

No people or society can be free without freedom of expression and of the press. The exercise of this freedom is not something authorities grant, it is an inalienable right of the people.

Every person has the right to seek and receive information, express opinions and disseminate them freely. No one may restrict or deny these rights.

The authorities must be compelled by law to make available in a timely and reasonable manner the information generated by the public sector. No journalist may be forced to reveal his or her sources of information.

Freedom of expression and of the press are severely limited by murder, terrorism, kidnapping, intimidation, the unjust imprisonment of journalists, the destruction of facilities, violence of any kind and impunity for perpetrators. Such acts must be investigated promptly and punished harshly.

Prior censorship, restrictions on the circulation of the media or dissemination of their reports, arbitrary management of information, the imposition of obstacles to the flow of news, and restrictions on the activities and movements of journalists directly contradict freedom of the press.

The media and journalists should neither be discriminated against nor favored because of what they write or say.

Tariff and exchange policies, licenses for the importation of paper or news-gathering equipment, the assigning of radio and television frequencies and the granting or withdrawal of government advertising may not be used to reward or punish the media or individual journalists.

The membership of journalists in guilds, their affiliation to professional and trade associations and the affiliation of the media with business groups must be strictly voluntary.

The credibility of the press is linked to its commitment to truth, to the pursuit of accuracy, fairness and objectivity and to the clear distinction between news and advertising. The attainment of these goals and the respect for ethical and professional values may not be imposed. These are the exclusive responsibility of journalists and the media. In a free society, it is public opinion that rewards or punishes.

No news medium nor journalist may be punished for publishing the truth or criticizing or denouncing the government.

MORATORIUM ON THE EPA'S PROPOSED NEW AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 20, 1997

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues RON KLING and RICK BOUCHER in introducing legislation that will place a 4-year moratorium on the Administrator of Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] authority to promulgate new or revised ambient air quality standards for ozone or fine particulate matter. We are introducing this legislation because the Administrator of the EPA appears determined to finalize the highly controversial new standards she proposed in November—in spite of widespread disagreement within the scientific community that they will produce any measurable improvement in human health and widespread certainty among State and local government officials across the Nation and even within other agencies of the Federal Government that the proposed new standard will wreak economic and social havoc.

Consider, for example, these excerpts from an November 20, 1996, letter from the Assistant Secretary of Transportation to Sally Katzen, Director of the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] office responsible for reviewing and signing off on the EPA's regulatory impact analysis of the proposed new standards. The letter calls into question not only the EPA's estimate of the cost of these new standards, but also its determination of the standards' positive impact on public health and the environment:

The social and economic disruption that the proposed changes will cause are not understood. The costs associated with the standards changes, both in terms of cost of compliance as well as economic impacts, will likely be large. . . . [It] is critical that the Administration understand the implications associated with such costs up front.

The impacts of the Clean Air Act sanctions on highway funding, as well as on stationary sources, could affect much larger areas, going well beyond those envisioned when the 1990 Amendments were passed. The enforcement consequences of these mandates would thus likely be profound. Better estimates of the impacts on transportation programs and the economy in general are necessary before the Administration commits to far more stringent standards.

There are substantial uncertainties and numerous subjective judgments required about the health effects and levels and form of the proposed standards. . . .

Control measures needed to meet the standards could have significant economic impacts on industry, including previously unregulated businesses, and require lifestyle changes by a significant part of the U.S. population.

Or consider these excerpts from an November 18, 1996 letter from the Small Business Administration to the Administrator of the EPA:

[Regarding the EPA's conclusion that the proposed rules will not have a significant economic impact on small entities] Considering the large economic impacts suggested by the EPA's own analysis that will unquestionably fall on tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of small businesses, this would be a startling proposition to the small business community.

. . . EPA's own draft November 3 analysis (admittedly very approximate) reveals