

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 ALIM

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

1996. She also coached the women's junior Olympic field hockey team to a gold medal in 1992. Such a dynasty can only be explained by tremendous coaching.

Linda is the recipient of many prestigious awards including the 1987 Merit Award from the Governor's Council on Fitness and Sport; the 1987 Gold Award, Franklin Life Insurance and Scholastic Coach magazine, Select Circle Coaching Award; the 1989 Garden State All Sports Foundation Award; the 1989 NJSIAA Executive Award; the 1989 Coca-Cola and Madison Square Garden Network Spotlight Award; the 1990 Outstanding Coaches Award for Field Hockey from the National Federation Interscholastic Coaches Association for the State of New Jersey; and the 1990 Boston College Sargent College Special Merit Award for Coaching Excellence. Linda was also the recipient of the 1994 Women's Sports Foundation Budget Car Coaches Award.

Linda was inducted into the New Jersey Interscholastic Athletic Association's Hall of Fame in 1985 and received the Boston University Harry Cleverly Award for Coaches Excellence that same year. She was inducted into the West Essex Regional High School Hall of Fame in 1991 and was named New Jersey's Winningest Field Hockey Coach in 1994 with an unprecedented 422 victories, 53 losses and 40 ties. Ms. Alimi was also named the Winningest Field Hockey Coach in the U.S.A. in 1996 for her amazing 457 victories. Linda received the Honor Award for Outstanding Leadership in Sports from the New Jersey Association for Girls and Women in Sports in 1996, and was the recipient of the 1996 Pathfinder Award presented by the National Association for Girls and Women in Sports. She was inducted into the NJSIAA Hall of Fame on December 2, 1996, placed in the National Federation High School Sports Record Book in 1997 and previewed in Sports Illustrated's Faces in the Crowd on March 17, 1997.

On top of being an exceptional coach, Linda Alimi is a member of numerous committees and involved in a number of activities. She has served as vice president of the West Essex Education Association 1987-88; been liaison committee chairperson to the board of education 1987-88; and was the originator and president of the North Jersey Field Hockey Coaches Association from 1974-85 and county representative from 1985-96. Linda was certified as an instructor in 1982 under the American Coaches Effectiveness Program, Level I and is presently the clinician and chairperson for the New Jersey Interscholastic Athletic Association. Ms. Alimi was a member of the New Jersey Governor's Council on Fitness and Sport from 1986-88, and the winner of the Garden State All Sports Foundation Award in 1988. She served as a member of the U.S. Field Hockey Association board of directors from 1988-92, on the NJSIAA Field Hockey Committee from 1989-96, and on the USFHA Futures Committee in 1994. Linda presently serves on the National Federation Field Hockey rules committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me, our colleagues, Linda's family, friends and teammates in recognizing Linda Ann Alimi's outstanding and invaluable service to the community.

DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1997

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss whether the United States should continue normal trade relations with China. If I believed for one moment that revoking our current trade status with China would improve the human rights situation there and benefit American workers, I would oppose renewal of most-favored-nation [MFN] status. However, revoking MFN would only serve to make matters worse.

To begin with, MFN is not a special privilege. It would be more accurate to call it "normal trade status" because it is the trade relationship our country has with 184 nations.

If the United States were to revoke this normal trade status, China is likely to retaliate against United States exports by increasing tariffs on these products. Such retaliation would put a large number of U.S. workers at a disadvantage. China is the United States' fifth largest trading partner, with our annual exports to that country having quadrupled to \$12 billion over the past decade. An estimated 170,000 Americans work in jobs that produce United States exports to China.

In my district, a number of companies, including ABB Drives and Rockwell [Allen-Bradley], have penetrated Chinese markets, expanding trade and job opportunities. In 1995, Wisconsin companies exported products worth \$142 million to that nation, an increase of 29 percent over the previous year. If the United States unilaterally denies normal trade status to China, other countries like Japan and the members of the European Union will immediately replace United States exports to that country.

Since none of our allies would be willing to join us in sanctioning China our sanctions would do the most damage to ourselves. In 1979, we made a similar mistake when we imposed a grain embargo upon the Soviet Union as punishment for the invasion of Afghanistan. What happened? The embargo cut off an important market for United States farmers while Canadian, Argentine, and European growers rushed in to fill the gap. We lifted the embargo in 1981 with a realization that it had had little impact on the Soviets. The Soviets did not get out of Afghanistan until years later, when the Afghans threw them out. This recent historical case illustrates that our unilateral sanctions wreak most of its punishment on one nation: ours.

When we placed sanctions upon South Africa several years ago, they were effective because we had the cooperation of all our major trading partners. If we revoke normal trading status with China, we will be doing it alone—and the Europeans and Japanese will take the business opportunities that United States companies will now be forced to forego.

Opponents of MFN renewal note that over the last several years we have had a growing trade deficit with China. However, the deficit figures show that while our trade deficit with

China has increased, our deficit with other major Asian exporters has decreased. In other words, according to the Institute for International Economics, Chinese imports of labor-intensive consumer goods have simply replaced the imports we used to get from Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Chinese production has largely displaced imports from other third-party nations, not United States domestic producers.

While I continue to be concerned about the human rights situation in China, is there any reason to believe that we can work to improve human rights by severing our normal trade relations with China? Historically, China's treatment of its own people has always been at its worst when it is most isolated, like their repressive Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976. By contrast, today reform in China has a tenuous foothold, thanks partly to our close economic engagement with that country. In the 2 previous years, over 39,000 Chinese students studied at United States universities, who will eventually return to their homeland having experienced American ideas of pluralism and democracy. In 1995, over 164,000 Chinese residents visited this country on business, and thousands more who do not visit here are supervised by American managers and work with American counterparts via phone and e-mail on a daily basis, and thereby get a sense of our politics, our economy, and our personal freedoms.

Regarding religious freedoms, a number of the missionary groups working on the ground in China have expressed their fears that revocation of MFN would hinder, not help, the cause of human rights there. The China Service Coordinating Office, an organization serving over 100 Christian organizations in service and witness there, fears that ending MFN would close doors in China through educational, cultural, and other exchanges, and cause harm to burgeoning social and political reforms. Similarly, Dr. Samuel Ling of the Billy Graham Center has called on "evangelical Christians to think twice before supporting efforts aimed at revoking China's MFN trade status."

Our engagement has led to a number of significant human rights advances over the last several years. Village elections have given millions of rural citizens access to a more democratic process for choosing local officials. Exposure to international norms and legal systems has played a role in China's legal reform effort to broaden citizens' rights. Reforms include the 1997 amendments to the criminal procedure law which impose limits on police detention of suspected criminals, and the 1994 state compensation law, which allows Chinese citizens to sue government officials and collect damages. By withdrawing economically, we jeopardize future reforms by reducing the positive influence we can continue to have on China.

A vote to continue MFN is not a vote in favor of the policies of the Chinese Government. A vote to continue our normal trade relations with China is a vote for an ongoing engagement which not only supports thousands of American jobs, but allows us to promote reform and democracy among the people of China.