

is a permanent fixture in West Orange" and "is always there when you need him, always willing to lend anyone a hand." West Orange Mayor Sam Spina has stated that John, "is a loyal, dedicated, trustworthy friend, someone this entire town can count on. He takes care of so much for us, and we are very lucky to have him." His generosity to people, organizations, and causes is well known, as well.

Throughout the years, John has been a good friend of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Alva Edison, Charles Edison, and former Governor Brendan Byrne. John has two children, John and Robert, three grandchildren, Karen, Bryan and Kevin, and four great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, John's family and friends, and the township of West Orange in recognizing John Petroll's outstanding and invaluable service to the community of West Orange.

#### CARDOZO SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL'S CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS

#### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, students from Cardozo Senior High School gave an outstanding performance in the national finals competition "We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution National Academic Program" which is administered by the Center for Civic Education.

These talented young students competed against 50 other classes from throughout the Nation and demonstrated a working knowledge of the fundamental ideas and values of the American constitutional government. The national finals competition simulated a congressional hearing where students testified as constitutional experts before a panel of judges.

I want to encourage these promising Cardozo Senior High School constitutional scholars Davida Baldwin, Ta Hoang, Andrea Jones, Thomas Richardson, Suleimon Shifaw, Tiffany Simms, Antoinette Stephenson, Zerai Kifle, Quana Teleferro, Levi Ruffin, Veronica Nguyen, and Toan Vu. I want to also salute Mr. Bruce Pendleton for utilizing strong learning patterns in teaching American Government.

I ask that this body join me in congratulating these young people, Mr. Bruce Pendleton, and the District of Columbia Coordinator, Sharon Yohannes-Bocar on this worthy accomplishment.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF THE YORK- TOWN HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS LA- CROSSE TEAM—NEW YORK STATE'S 1997 STATE CHAMPIONS

#### HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row, the members of Yorktown High School's girls lacrosse team have won the New York State Public High School Athletic Association's [NYSPPHAA] girls lacrosse State championship, and I would like to take

a few moments to recognize these young women from my district, each of whom has exhibited great dedication, outstanding teamwork, and extraordinary perseverance.

In 1996, the Yorktown Cornhuskers won the NYSPPHAA girls lacrosse competition in Division B. Over the past year, increasing student enrollment at Yorktown High School placed the girls lacrosse team in Division A.

Mr. Speaker, any sports fan would be inspired by the manner in which the Yorktown High School girls lacrosse team responded to their placement in the highly competitive Division A. The Cornhuskers found themselves competing against teams representing schools with student bodies as much as four times larger than Yorktown's. In spite of the odds, the Yorktown High School girls lacrosse team played a remarkable season, decisively winning the NYSPPHAA Division A championship. In doing so, the Yorktown Cornhuskers became the first girls' lacrosse team in the State of New York to first win a championship in one division and then win in a higher division the immediate following year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate each of these motivated young women, as well as their parents and coaches, for the Yorktown Cornhuskers' repeated success. High school varsity athletes are expected to commit a great deal of time to their sport. For the members of the Yorktown High School girls lacrosse team initiative and hard work are the norm.

However, the coaches and parents of these young women also deserve recognition, because without their devotion, these young women would have had trouble reaching the goals that they have. So by supporting their children, the parents of these young women have profoundly nurtured their daughters' ambitions. And certainly no less significant than their parents' guidance, a sound coach who positively motivates the members of a team—such as their's surely does, by constantly pushing them to fulfill their potential, also played a significant role in their success.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the young women of the Yorktown High School girls lacrosse team. Their hard work, commitment, and teamwork should serve as a model for us all. I congratulate the Cornhuskers for their hard-fought and well-deserved victory, and I wish them continued success in all their future seasons.

#### PRESERVE OUR NATION'S FARMLAND

#### HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the family farms of Lancaster and Chester Counties are national treasures. Sadly, pristine farmland which has been operated by families in the 16th District of Pennsylvania for generations is at risk due to the Federal estate tax. Many family farms in southeast Pennsylvania and across this Nation are sold in an effort to pay off huge estates taxes, and others are sold to developers in fear of the impending estate tax. Thanks to excessive taxation, our Nation's farms are slowly being eliminated.

That is why I am introducing the Farm Preservation Act today. This bill will protect our

farmland by eliminating estate taxes on a farm which has a covenant ensuring that the land will remain a farm. By eliminating the estate tax on farms, families can be rest assured that their life's work will not be abandoned once the farm is left to a family member who will continue the farming tradition. Further, this bill waives all capital gains taxes on the sale of a farm which will be used only as farmland. This provision provides a real incentive for people who must sell their farm to ensure that it remains in agricultural production in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in order to preserve our precious farmland, we need to end the tax practices which destroy them. We must also provide incentives for people to keep farmland undeveloped. The Farm Preservation Act accomplishes these important goals. As we consider another tax relief bill in 1998, I urge Members to join me in protecting our Nation's farmland and provide real opportunities to keep family farmers in business.

#### WHY I SUPPORT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from June 1997 entitled "Why I Support Normal Trade Relations for China."

I ask that this newsletter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

#### WHY I SUPPORT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS FOR CHINA

Earlier this month, the House of Representatives voted to extend normal trade relations, known as "most favored nation" (MFN) status, for China for another year. The MFN debate was hotly contested. Opponents argued that China's record on human rights, trade, proliferation and other issues did not justify extending normal trade relations. I disagree. Engagement—including normal trade relations—is the best means to bring China into the international community and to achieve U.S. political, economic and security objectives.

China matters. China is the world's most populous country, with the largest army and one of the largest economies. Its actions directly affect peace and stability throughout East and Southeast Asia. As a permanent member of the UN Security Council, China has a say in many decisions affecting U.S. interests. How China evolves will profoundly affect our economic, political and security interests. If China becomes a threat, the U.S. defense budget will go up, tensions in Asia will rise, and Asia's prosperity will be at risk. If we keep U.S.-China relations on track, peace and security in Asia will be strengthened, prospects for human rights will be enhanced, and Asia's remarkable economic growth will continue.

A policy of engagement. By extending normal trade relations for another year, the House chose a policy of engagement over a policy of isolation. I agree. Engagement has been the policy of every President, Democratic and Republican, for twenty-five years. Engagement is not appeasement. It does not mean ignoring our differences with China. It means actively engaging China to resolve our differences. It means hard bargaining in pursuit of American objectives.

Engagement works. It has produced results, such as Chinese adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention. Because of engagement, China helped persuade North Korea to sign the pact freezing that country's nuclear weapons program. China's cooperation in the UN Security Council helped create the coalition that defeated Iraq in the Gulf War.

Engagement with China has changed the lives of hundreds of millions of Chinese for the better. The exchange of goods, ideas, and people has brought increased openness, social mobility, and personal opportunities for the Chinese people.

Because we are engaged with China, we can use our trade laws to attack Chinese trade barriers and to help American firms export to China. Because we are engaged with China, we can work together to combat terrorism, alien smuggling, and illegal narcotics. China also cooperates on environmental and public health issues—matters with a direct impact on our well-being.

Key issues. Engagement has not solved all problems. We still have many concerns about Chinese behavior. China continues to fall far short on human rights, for example. China today remains an oppressive society. Political expression is limited, and the rights of the individual are subordinated to the interests of the state—as defined by a self-selected party elite.

But China is light years ahead of where it was 25 years ago. Personal freedoms for the average Chinese—choice of employment, place of residence, freedom of movement—are greater than ever before. The lesson of China since President Nixon's visit in 1972—and the lessons of South Korea, Taiwan, and other former dictatorships that are now democracies—is that U.S. engagement is the best way to promote human rights.

The \$38 billion U.S. trade deficit with China is another source of tension. Yet revoking normal trading status will not significantly reduce this deficit or bring back lost jobs. Other countries that, like China, can produce labor-intensive goods more cheaply than we can will simply pick up the slack. The best way to reduce the trade deficit is not to revoke MFN—which might even increase the deficit—but to bring China into the World Trade Organization, so that we can reduce Chinese trade barriers and help American exporters compete on a level playing field.

On non-proliferation, China has moved in the right direction. Despite this progress, I remain concerned about Chinese transfers of missile and chemical weapons technology and advanced conventional weapons to Iran, about Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran and Pakistan, and about Chinese missile sales to Pakistan. But, as the recent record shows, we are more likely to persuade China to accept international norms if we engage China than if we isolate it.

Revoking MFN. If Congress had revoked MFN, it would have damaged U.S. interests at home, in China and around the world. Revoking MFN would likely make the human rights situation in China worse, not better. It would undermine our stature throughout Asia. Our allies in the region, who support U.S. engagement and benefit from U.S.-China trade, would lose confidence in our judgment and ability to play a constructive role in East Asia. Hong Kong and Taiwan, which support engagement, would be worse off if we revoked MFN. We would also be losing the support of one of five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which would hurt U.S. interests globally.

Revoking MFN would hurt the United States at home. We would lose markets for \$12 billion worth of U.S. exports, which sup-

port 170,000 high-paying U.S. jobs. It would raise prices here on low-cost imports. It would deny us access to China's huge market.

Conclusion. The United States could not isolate China even if we wanted to—China is too big, and too important. We can disengage from China, but no one would follow us and we would only hurt our interests. If we treat China as an enemy, it will become one. Engagement offers a proven record of moving China toward international norms, and a better prospect for achieving U.S. objectives than a policy of isolation.

#### CHARLES STITH DISCUSSES RACIAL PROGRESS

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, people often call for dialog on difficult issues, but rarely engage in it beyond talking about what a nice idea it would be if we had some. In the June 29 issue of the *Boston Globe*, Charles R. Stith of Boston, President of the Organization for a New Equality made a genuinely useful contribution to the dialog on race that we should be having. I have known Charles Stith for many years and I am an admirer of the work he has done on many fronts to further the cause of racial justice—and indeed social justice for all people—in greater Boston and in America. I believe his short essay is a wise and useful contribution to the national conversation and given the importance of this topic and his credentials to speak out on it, I ask that it be printed here.

President Clinton has challenged Americans to resume our efforts on racial reconciliation and plans to lead us in a national dialogue toward that end. After listening to the pundits, pontificators, and prognosticators muse about the virtues and failings of the president's effort, I will add my view to the discussion. It can be summarized in one word—hope.

There is cause for hope when it comes to racial justice and racial reconciliation in this country. The naysayers are not credible arbiters of history. If the past 30 years mean anything, they are a testament to the possibility of change.

I am of that generation of African-Americans born on the cusp of discriminatory laws, customs, and change. I remember integrating the Fox movie theater during my adolescent years in St. Louis. I remember my brother and me getting dressed on that fateful day in our "Sunday-go-to-meeting clothes" and being admonished by our mother not to do "anything to embarrass the race."

America has come a long way since those days. Not only are we beyond the embarrassment and inconvenience of petty apartheid American-style, but we have made some equally important advances in other areas.

For example, in 1960 approximately 18 percent of African-American families were middle class; by 1990 there were 42 percent. About 30 years ago there were 1,400 black elected officials; today there are close to 10,000. In that group are black mayors of predominantly white cities and a US senator.

In addition, minority-owned businesses are one of the fastest growing segments of the economy. The number of businesses owned by minorities in the United States increased 60 percent between 1987 and 1992. This com-

pares to an increase of 26 percent for all US firms over the same period.

On the social front, there is a broader acceptance in both the black and white communities of interracial marriage and interracial adoption.

Are we as a nation where we ought to be regarding racial justice and reconciliation? Obviously not; ergo the necessity of the national dialogue. But having acknowledged that, the past 30 years provide a demonstration of what can be accomplished if there is a will.

The other reason that hope ought to be the first word in this national dialogue on race relations is the flip side of the first. The progress achieved over the past 30 years was possible because people believed that we should not live as a "house divided against itself" and that we could do something individually and societally to make a difference. If we are to finish the unfinished business of racial reconciliation in this country, then people have to believe that things can change. The reason is simple: unless people believe that there is a way, there is no will.

Those on the left must go beyond bashing Clinton for what they see as his inadequacies of perspective and policy. We must stop contributing to the cynicism that grips the nation. If we don't, then just as we lost political power at the national level in '92, we will also lose our moral authority to challenge the nation to pursue the high ground of racial justice and racial reconciliation. If we are not in the vanguard of trying to lead this nation to believing again that the quest to bring people together across color, class, and community lines is worthwhile, then who will?

We might do well to reflect on Martin Luther King Jr.'s essay "A Testament of Hope:"

"I am an optimist," he wrote, because while "it is possible for me to falter, I am profoundly secure in my knowledge that God loves us; he has not worked out a design for our failure. Man has the capacity to do right as well as wrong, and his history is a path upward, not downward. The past is strewn with the ruins of empires of tyranny, and each is a monument not merely to man's blunders but to his capacity to overcome them."

#### TRIBUTE TO LINDA ANN ALIMI

#### HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, July 8, 1997*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention Linda Ann Alimi of West Essex, NJ.

Linda received her bachelor of science from Boston University in 1965 and received her master of arts from Montclair State University in 1977. She graduated summa cum laude and was elected to Phi Kappa Phi, the National Honor Society.

Ms. Alimi has coached the women's field hockey team of West Essex High School for 32 years. She clinched conference titles 25 out of 27 years—1970–79, 1981, 1983–95, and 1996, Essex County titles 5 times—1974, 1975, 1987, 1990, 1991, and North Jersey sectional titles 19 times—1971–76, 1978, 1981, 1983, 1984, 1987, 1989, 1991–93, and 1996. West Essex has been ranked the No. 1 women's field hockey team in New Jersey 3 times—1984, 1992, 1993, and the No. 2 team in the State 4 times—1987, 1989, 1991, and