

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE  
CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE  
GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP  
BOX DERBY**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again introduce a resolution for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to hold its race along Constitution Avenue. This bill will permit the 59th running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, which is to take place on the Capitol Grounds on Saturday, June 24th, 2000.

This resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby in complete compliance with rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

In the past, the full House has supported this resolution once reported favorably by the full Transportation Committee. I ask for my colleagues to join with me, and Representatives ALBERT WYNN, CONNIE MORELLA, JIM MORAN, and TOM DAVIS, in supporting this resolution.

From 1992 to 1999, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby welcomed over 40 contestants which made the Washington, DC race one of the largest in the country. Participants range from ages 9 to 16 and hail from communities in Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia. The winners of this local event will represent the Washington Metropolitan Area in the National Race, which will be held in Akron, Ohio on July 22, 2000.

The Soap Box Derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills such as engineering and aerodynamics. Furthermore, the Derby promotes team work, a strong sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibility. These are positive attributes that we should encourage children to carry into adulthood.

The young people involved spend months preparing for this race, and the day that they complete it makes it all the more worthwhile.

FORMER UAW PRESIDENT UNDER-  
STANDS THAT PNTR FOR CHINA  
IS IN AMERICA'S NATIONAL IN-  
TEREST**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on providing China with Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status conditioned on China's entry into the World Trade

Organization (WTO) intensifies, I recommend to my colleagues and submit for the RECORD the following commentary written by Leonard Woodcock in the Los Angeles Times on March 9, 2000. A key lieutenant in the 1930's drive to unionize the U.S. auto industry, Mr. Woodcock rose in the union ranks to become president of the United Auto Workers union from 1971–1977. Later that decade he served as the United States Ambassador to China. Indeed, Mr. Woodcock is uniquely qualified to judge from a labor perspective the merits and impact of providing China with PNTR in the context of the United States-China WTO bilateral accession agreement. He supports the agreement and PNTR status for China. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why other labor leaders and their Democratic supporters in Congress cannot be as supportive as is the former president of the United Auto Workers, Leonard Woodcock.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 9, 2000]

EVOLUTION DOESN'T OCCUR OVERNIGHT

WTO AGREEMENT: ORGANIZED LABOR SHOULD  
SUPPORT IT. IT'S IN BOTH U.S. AND CHINESE  
INTERESTS

(By Leonard Woodcock)

The recent U.S.–China World Trade Organization bilateral accession agreement appears to be good for workers in both countries. I was privileged, as U.S. ambassador to China, to sign the 1979 trade agreement that provided for most-favored-nation trade status to China and have, as a private citizen, been involved with this issue for many years.

American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the U.S. The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal. The agreement expands American jobs. And while China already enjoys WTO-based access to our economy, this agreement will open China's economy to unprecedented levels of American exports, many of which are high-quality goods produced by high-paying jobs.

There is reason to fear unfair trade practices. Yet this agreement actually provides better protections than our existing laws allow. It stipulates 12 years of protections against market surges and provides unusually strong anti-dumping laws—which aim to counter unfairly priced imports—for 15 years.

I have, therefore, been startled by organized labor's vociferous negative reaction to this agreement. The reality is that the U.S. as a whole benefits mightily from this historic accord. The AFL–CIO argues that nothing in this agreement demands that free trade unions be formed in China. Yet the WTO does not require this of any of its 136 member countries, and the WTO is the wrong instrument to use to achieve unionization.

We should, instead, be asking a more important question: Are Chinese workers better off with or without this agreement? The answer is that this agreement, in a variety of ways, will be enormously beneficial to Chinese workers.

On a subtle level, the changes the agreement requires of China's economic system will work in favor of investment by Western firms and take away some of the key advan-

tages Asian firms now enjoy in China. Every survey has demonstrated that working conditions and environmental standards in plants run by West European and North American firms are usually better than those in Asian and in indigenous Chinese firms.

The greater foreign presence also will expose Chinese workers to more ideas about organization and rights. That is perhaps one reason why almost every Chinese political dissident who has spoken out on this issue has called the U.S.–China WTO agreement good news for freedom in China.

The trade deficit with China is a troublesome one to the labor movement. We need to put it in perspective in two ways. First, if we were to block access of goods from China to the U.S., this would not increase American jobs. That is because the Chinese exports—mostly toys, tools, apparel, cheap electronics, etc.—would be produced in other low-wage countries, not in the U.S. Yet if China stopped buying from us, we would lose about 400,000 jobs, mostly high-wage.

Second, a large portion of exports from "China" are goods produced in the main in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The major components are then shipped to China for final assembly and packaging, but the entire cost of the item (often only 15% of which was contributed in China) is attributed to China's export ledger. Exports to the U.S. from Hong Kong and Taiwan have declined over the past decade almost as fast as imports from China have increased. Yet the companies making the profits are in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and they will simply shift their operations to Vietnam or elsewhere if we close down exports from China.

Americans are broadly concerned about the rights and quality of life of Chinese citizens. My perspective on this serious issue is influenced by my experience in the U.S. In my lifetime, women were not allowed the vote, and labor was not allowed to organize. And, in my lifetime, although the law did not permit lynching, it was protected and carried out by legal officeholders. As time passed, we made progress, and I doubt if lectures or threats from foreigners would have moved things faster.

Democracy, including rights for workers, is an evolutionary process. Isolation and containment will not promote improved rights for a people. Rather, working together and from within a society will, over time, promote improved conditions. The U.S.–China WTO agreement will speed up the evolutionary process in China. American labor should support it because it is in our interests, and it is the interests of Chinese workers too.

PROFESSOR HELLE PORSDAM: A  
DISTINCTIVE INSIGHT ON AMER-  
ICAN CULTURE AND THE LAW**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to take notice of the work of a talented Danish scholar, Professor Helle

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Porsdam of Denmark's Odense University. Dr. Porsdam's book, *Legally Speaking: Contemporary American Culture and the Law*, which was recently published by the University of Massachusetts Press, offers evidence of her extraordinary perceptiveness in her analysis of American culture.

In *Legally Speaking*, Dr. Porsdam discusses the social impact of the law in the United States. Whereas many European and Asian nations find symbols of their national identity in royalty or an established church, Americans look to an institution far more consistent with our egalitarian roots: our system of justice. Despite our frequent frustrations with the legal profession—ambulance-chasing lawyers, legal “sharks,” frivolous lawsuits, the O.J. Simpson trial—the law epitomizes our most cherished civil ideals of fairness and equality. When a citizen is wronged, we look to the courts to make things right. When a crime is committed, the courts offer our sole vehicle for judgment and punishment. When our rights are violated, our courts can restore them. For this reason, Dr. Porsdam contends, the law serves more than just a functional purpose for the American people: it is a “civil religion” in which we place a particular kind of faith. The courts arbitrate more than just lawsuits and criminal cases; they pass judgment on our hopes and dreams as well.

Dr. Porsdam's book analyzes America's moral investment in the legal system, and it further demonstrates how this facet of our national identity has permeated our culture. From *The People's Court* to *L.A. Law*, from Tom Wolfe's *Bonfire of the Vanities* to Scott Turow's *Presumed Innocent*, the evidence of our society's attraction to judicial institutions is overwhelming. Dr. Porsdam carefully and thoughtfully explores the connections between the allure of the law and our faith in it.

The perceptiveness of Dr. Porsdam in *Legally Speaking* has earned the endorsement of scholars across our country. Lewis D. Sargentich of Harvard Law School noted that the book is “full of valuable insight.” Her “emphasis on the symbolic, unifying, aspirational side of law in American life, and her showing of this aspect of law through a close look at a series of contemporary ‘cultural texts,’ combine to produce a unique scholarly contribution.” Maxwell H. Bloomfield, the author of *American Lawyers in a Changing Society*, was equally effusive, praising Dr. Porsdam's work as “an innovative and engaging study exploring the pervasive influence of law in the shaping of contemporary American culture. It is a strikingly original piece of work for which no comparable models exist.”

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with these distinguished scholars. I urge my colleagues to join me in reading *Legally Speaking* and in appreciating the brilliant observations of Dr. Helle Porsdam.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 8, 2000, I was on a plane returning from my district and was unable to attend votes. Had I been here I would have made the

following votes: Rollcall Nos. 29—“aye”; 30—“aye”; 31—“aye”; 32—“aye”; and 33—“aye”.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF THE BROOKLYN CHINESE-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION'S TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association (BCA) in honor of its Twelfth Anniversary.

An ancient Chinese proverb states: “If you want 1 year of prosperity, grow grain. If you want 10 years of prosperity, grow trees. If you want 100 years of prosperity, grow people” Twelve years ago, the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association did just that. The Association started out as a small, social services agency with a mission to provide assistance to the growing Asian-American community in Sunset Park, Borough Park and Bay Ridge sections of Brooklyn.

Since then, the Asian-American community has seen tremendous growth and recent estimates show that more than 200,000 people of Asian descent now live throughout the borough. As a result, Sunset Park and its surrounding neighborhoods are commonly known as “Brooklyn Chinatown.”

BCA has expanded throughout the years to meet the growing need of Asian-Americans by providing day care and senior centers, with a main community center and ten other service sites in Sunset Park, Borough Park, Bay Ridge, Sheepshead Bay and Bensonhurst.

Through its programs and services, BCA provides assistance to more than 800 individuals a day. Stepping into a new Millennium and its thirteenth year of community services, offering a wide array of new programs including comprehensive bilingual social services and other programs to meet the growing challenges in this new century.

What started out as a small agency has flourished into the largest community-based, multi-human services community development organization, providing assistance to Asian-Americans throughout the borough of Brooklyn as well as other parts of the city.

I congratulate BCA on its Twelfth Anniversary and wish the Association continued prosperity as it offers members of the Asian-American community guidance today, tomorrow and into the future.

#### HONORING VETERANS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR

SPEECH OF

### HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 8, 2000*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House of Representatives joined together in a bipartisan fashion to pass House Joint Resolution 86, legislation recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean war and commending the

bravery and patriotism of the 5.72 million men and women who fought bravely in that conflict. I have spoken with many New Jerseyans who served in the Korean war, and I can tell you, this tribute is long overdue.

Too often we hear the Korean war referred to as the “forgotten war,” because it was sandwiched between this Nation's victory in World War II and the Vietnam war. Because of that, the over 55,000 men and women who lost their lives in the Korean war, and those who served, sometimes do not receive the recognition and gratitude that they are owed. I am hopeful that Congress' passage of this legislation will serve as a first step towards reversing that gross inequity.

Victory during World War II signaled the beginning of a world where the United States shouldered the role of undisputed leader of the free world. America was the only democratic power capable of responding to the spreading advances of communism when North Korea commenced its attack on the south. With the aid of the Soviet Union and China, North Korea thought they would swiftly and easily unite the Korean peninsula under communist rule. Only through the blood and sacrifice of men in a thousand dark battles, was the tide turned and freedom restored.

The determination that America showed in Korea set in motion the events that ultimately led to the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of Soviet communism. By standing up for freedom and democracy in South Korea we sent a clear message that where democracy was threatened, the United States would stand firm. Here in Washington, DC, the inscription at the Korean Memorial reminds us that “freedom is not free,” and that the young American men and women who have been willing to pay the price for freedom are owed a tremendous debt of gratitude. We must remember their sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, the brave men and women who served in the Korean war fought not for personal gain, but rather to insure freedom for all generations to come. We must not forget what their blood bought. I hope my colleagues will join with me to honor and call attention to our nation's Korean war veterans.

#### MILITARY RECRUITERS SHOULD BE WELCOME IN HIGH SCHOOLS

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends and submits for the RECORD an editorial from the March 7, 2000, Norfolk Daily News expressing concern that some public high schools do not cooperate with military recruiters while allowing universities and colleges on campus. High school students should have a full range of postsecondary options presented to them, in order to make an informed decision about life after high school.

[From the Daily News, Mar. 7, 2000]

COOPERATION IS IMPORTANT DUTY—RECRUITERS DESERVE WELCOME FROM ALL OF NATION'S PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

Members of the Senate Armed Services Personnel subcommittee heard testimony recently that many high schools refuse to cooperate with military recruiters. It is important for members of Congress to find out