TRIBUTE TO FERNANDO LUIS GAR-CIA, EURIPIDES RUBIO, JR., CAR-LOS JAMES LOZADA AND HEC-TOR COLON SANTIAGO

## HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday June 6, 2000

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the deeds of four distinguished servicemen, who were honored on Friday, May 26, 2000 by the Puerto Rican Parade of Paterson 2000/Desfile Puertorriqueno, Inc. 2000 in coordination with Memorial Day. It is only fitting since these soldiers, Fernando Luis Garcia, Euripides Rubio, Jr., Carlos James Lozada and Hector Colon Santiago are among the 3.400 plus brave men that have merited the Medal of Honor. The Medal of Honor is the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the Armed Services of the United States. The Medal is generally presented to its recipient by the President of the United States of America in the name of Congress, it is often called the Congressional Medal of Honor. The world lost four truly remarkable people when these four brave men perished while in the line of duty.

Fernando Luis Garcia served as a Private First Class in the United States Marine Corps, Company, 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division. He entered the service in San Juan Puerto Rico. He was born on August 14, 1929 in Utuado, Puerto Rico.

The stellar life of Fernando Luis Garcia was cut short when he was killed in Korea on September 5, 1952. An excerpt from his citation notes, "He was intrepid in his service as a member of Company I, in action against enemy aggressor forces. PFC Garcia unhesitatingly chose to sacrifice himself for the life of another Marine. His great personal valor and cool decision in the face of almost certain death, sustain and enhance the finest traditions of the United States Naval Services. He gallantly gave his life for his country."

Euripides Rubio, Jr. attained the rank of Captain in the United States Army in Head-quarters and Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, 28th Infantry, 1st Infantry Division, RVN. He entered the service at Fort Buchanan in Puerto Rico. He was born on March 1, 1938 in Ponce, Puerto Rico.

The military exploits of Euripides Rubio were marked with bravery and valor. He started his tour of duty on July 10, 1966 and lost his life on November 8, 1966 in Tay Ninh Province, Republic of Vietnam. He was 28 years old. His citation shows he was feted for, "Braving withering fire, aiding the wounded, unhesitatingly assuming command and self-lessly exposing himself to enemy fire. Captain Rubio's singularly heroic act turned the tide of battle, and his extraordinary leadership and valor were a magnificent inspiration to his men." His name can be found on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC on the wall panel 12E, row 44.

Carlos James Lozada served his country at the rank of Private First Class in the United States Army, 2nd Battalion, 503rd Infantry, 173rd Airborne Brigade. He entered the service in New York City, New York. He was born on September 6, 1946 in Caguas, Puerto Rico.

The venerable Carlos James Lozada began his tour of duty on June 11, 1967. He was struck down, while missing, at the age of 21. He died on November 20, 1967 in Dak To. Republic of Vietnam. Part of his citation reads, "PFC Lozada apparently realized that if he abandoned his position, there would be nothing to hold back the surging North Vietnamese solders and that the entire Company withdrawal would be jeopardized. He made this decision realizing that the enemy was converging on three sides. His heroic deed served as an inspiration to his comrades throughout the ensuing four-day battle." His name is inscribed on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall panel 30E, row 45.

Hector Colon Santiago's rank was Specialist Fourth Class. He served in the United States Army, Company B, 5th Battalion, 7th Cavalry Division. He entered the service in New York City, New York. He was born on December 20, 1942 in Salinas, Puerto Rico.

A remarkable individual, Hector Colon Santiago began his tour of duty on October 23, 1967. He died at the age of 25 on June 28, 1968 in Quang Tri Province, Republic of Vietnam. A portion of his citation states, "Specialist Fourth Class Santiago-Colon distinguished himself at the cost of his life while serving as a gunner in the mortar platoon of Company B. He heroically sacrificed himself to save the lives of those who occupied the foxhole with him, and provided them with the inspiration to continue fighting until they had forced the enemy to retreat from the perimeter." His name is etched in the wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on panel 54W. Row, 13.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, the Puerto Rican Parade of Paterson 2000/Desfile Puertorriqueno, Inc. 2000, Puerto Rico, the United States and me in recognizing the outstanding and invaluable achievements and sacrifices of Fernando Luis Garcia, Euripides Rubio, Jr., Carlos James Lozada and Hector Colon Santiago. Each of these men was cited for, "Conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty."

TRIBUTE TO MARY KORTE—PRESI-DENTIAL AWARD FOR EXCEL-LENCE

## HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to congratulate Mary Korte for receiving the 1999 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. She is one of 200 teachers to receive this prestigious award nationally and one of four to receive this award from Colorado. She will also receive a \$7,500 grant in the name of Grand Junction High School in conjunction with the award. Her dedication and enthusiasm are unsurpassed in the field of math and science.

Mary's real passion lies in educating her students about the environment. A class entitled "River Dynamics" is one included in her curriculum. This class allows students to rigorously investigate rivers using many different academic skills. She encourages students to

be "hands on" and enjoys seeing them actively participate in their environmental communities.

It is encouraging to see teachers of Mary's stature receive awards for excellence in their prescribed academic rigor. Mary has also received the Radio Shack National Teachers Award among her many accomplishments. I am confident she will continue to strive for academic excellence and continue to encourage our future generations to pursue an active role in the health of their environment.

THE ADMISSION OF ISRAEL TO THE "WEOG" GROUP AT THE UNITED NATIONS IS A CRITICAL STEP FORWARD

## HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the leaders of Western Europe took an immensely important step by inviting the State of Israel to join the "Western Europe and Other Group" (WEOG) at the United Nations. Membership in a regional grouping is significant at the United Nations because seats on the UN Security Council and other similar rotating positions are made through regional caucuses.

Israel has been a member of the United Nations since 1949—the year after the State of Israel was officially proclaimed—but during that half century, until it was invited to join the WEOG group last week, it was never a member of a regional group. As a result, Israel is the only country in the UN never to hold one of the rotating Security Council seats.

Mr. Speaker, this welcome decision is one that many of our colleagues in the Congress have fought to achieve through letters, resolutions and similar actions. Several months ago, at my suggestion, the ambassadors in Washington of the countries who are members of the WEOG group were invited to a meeting with members of the Committee on International Relations, where we pressed for the inclusion of Israel in that regional grouping. This important meeting made clear to our friends in Western Europe the importance that we in the Congress have given to this issue, and I think it was essential in helping to overcome the ill-founded resistance to Israel's participation in WEOG.

Ås I said to that large group of ambassadors attending the meeting, geographical proximity is not a consideration since WEOG includes, Turkey, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, in addition to the countries of Western Europe. Israel's strong links with Europe and North America as well as its advanced economy make its interests and policies very consistent with those of the other participants in the WEOG. Israel's exclusion from the Asia Group and the Middle East subgroup is a case of blatant discrimination and a deliberate effort to de-legitimize the State of Israel.

Some of the countries who are members of WEOG were particularly supportive of Israel's participation, and I want to thank in particular the United Kingdom, as well as the northern countries of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland for their enlightened efforts on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to pay tribute to many of those who have worked to bring Israel into more complete participation in the United Nations.

The United States representative to the UN, Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, has been an important voice for resolving this issue. He appropriately called this decision to admit Israel to WEOG "the rectification of a long-standing and wholly inexcusable exclusion of one country—and one country only—from any of the regional groups of the United Nations."

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan also has personally been involved in the effort to resolve this important issue. When Israel was invited to join the WEOG the Secretary General said "this step rectifies a long-standing anomaly" which "should pave the way for Israel to participate on an equal footing with other nations in the main organs of the United Nations, and it upholds the principle, enshrined in the Charter, of equality among all member states."

Mr. Speaker, this temporary membership for Israel in WEOG is not the final step for Israel's full participation in the United Nations, and I am disappointed that the United Nations is still treating Israel differently than other nations. Although Israel will be a member of WEOG, it has been asked to forgo the opportunity to take its turn holding the most influential seats, such as the Security Council, for the foreseeable future. Also, the invitation does not include the right to participate in European caucuses at United Nations regional offices in Geneva, Vienna, and Nairobi. The failure to include Israel in Geneva caucuses is significant because the UN Human Rights Commission is headquartered in Geneva, and this organization has frequently taken a hostile attitude toward Israel

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the decision of the WEOG to invite Israel to participate, but I emphasize that this is only a first step. Unfortunately, this first step does not fully rectify the half-century of discrimination at the United Nations to which the State of Israel has been subjected. I look forward to Israel's full participation, and I invite my colleagues to join me as we continue our efforts in this regard.

AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S RE-PUBLIC OF CHINA

SPEECH OF

## HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday May 24, 2000

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering an incredibly important piece of legislation, legislation that will affect the way our Nation and our world move into the next millennium. However, I would like to outline three simple points that should show why supporting Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China is the right thing to do, both for the benefit of the United States and the people of China. Those three points are the economic benefits to American workers and business, the human rights benefits for the people of China, and the necessity to move forward into a more productive and challenging relationship with the government of China.

First, and most important to our communities and constituents, is the way in which PNTR for China will help Americans economically.

Many people become understandably confused over the complexities of trade policy. However, the necessity of PNTR can be easily explained. China will soon be joining the WTO, and that is not a matter to be decided in Congress. However, as part of the terms of their accession to the WTO, China has been required to negotiate a bilateral trade agreement with the United States. We won those negotiations.

The agreement that was reached requires China to throw open their doors to American business and agriculture. They will reduce tariffs on American-made products from automobiles and aircraft landing systems, to sovbeans and pork products. They will dramatically reduce existing quotas on American made products. They will increase the access to their domestic economy by opening up distribution and marketing channels. All of these changes mean that American businesses will be able to sell more of their products to more Chinese people. At the same time, the United States gives up nothing to the Chinese-not one single thing. There is absolutely nothing in this agreement that would encourage an American company to move to China. In fact the agreement actually gives American companies more incentive to stay in the United States. More exports to China means more jobs for Americans at better wages. Passing PNTR will change the status quo, and allow us to export American products, not American jobs.

However, if this body fails to pass this measure today, the United States will not be able to take advantage of that deal. The current status quo will remain, and American companies will find it increasingly difficult to sell their wares to a booming Chinese market. In fact, due to the fact that the European Union, and other countries in Asia and around the world have similar agreements with China, American companies will actually be worse off than they are now! The other WTO members will be able to market their products to China more efficiently than we can, effectively shutting the United States out of the China market.

The choice is simple: Economic stagnation and regression, or commercial growth and prosperity. We need to respond to the new global economy, driven by a technological revolution, with a new fair trade policy.

The choice is just as clear on the issue of human rights.

It may be easy for people in Washington, D.C. to speculate what policies might be best for the Chinese people. However, when it comes to improving the human rights and political freedoms of people in China, I tend to place more weight on what the people in China, fighting those fights every day, think is best for themselves.

The following human rights advocates strongly endorse this new policy:

Martin Lee—chairman of the Democratic Party of Hong Kong which struggles daily to maintain the freedoms that are unique to that region:

Xie Wanjun—chief director of the China Democracy Party, most of whose members are now in detention in China;

Nie Minzhi—a member of the China Democracy party who is under house arrest as we stand in this chamber today;

Zhou Yang—a veteran of the 1979 Democracy Wall movement;

Bao Tong—a persecuted dissident and human rights activist;

Dai Quing—an environmentalist and writer who served time in prison after Tiananmen Square;

Zhou Litai—a pioneering Chinese labor lawyer who represents injured workers in legal battles against Chinese companies;

Even the Dalai Lama himself, probably the most famous Chinese dissident in the world, supports WTO accession.

All of these people have been fighting for democracy and freedom in China on the ground, day-to-day. They all say the same thing: Support PNTR for China. They say this because they have seen how the annual renewal of NTR for China has become a bargaining chip for an oppressive government. They have seen firsthand how engagement with the United States has made China a more open society. They don't want to become isolated from the world. They want to join us in freedom and democracy.

Working to ensure human rights in China is the right thing to do. However voting against PNTR is not the way to do it. We need to listen to the brave people fighting the good fight on the ground in China, and we need to pass PNTR. Very prominent Americans, such as Gen. Colin Powell, Rev. Billy Graham, and President Jimmy Carter agree with this approach.

Finally, I want to stress the need for a change in our relationship with China. While we have come to see some improvement in China since the late 1970's, the Chinese government has still remained insular, resistant to change, and unwilling to allow sweeping reforms. The relationship between our two countries has warmed, but it has not completely thawed

Voting against PNTR is telling China and the rest of the world that you like things the way they are today; that you prefer the status quo. As a an elected representative to Congress however, I cannot in good conscience say that keeping the status quo with China is best way for our country to proceed in this new millennium.

Isolation and recriminations in the face of repression get us nowhere. One only has to look next door to China to North Korea. We cut that country off from the world fifty years ago, and look what happened to them. North Korea is easily one of the most unstable, irrational, and hostile nations on this planet. Human rights and political freedoms are non-existent, and on top of it all, their people are slowly starving to death in a massive famine. Is that what we want China to become? Do we want to shut China off from the world? Will we refuse to challenge and engage the Chinese government?

I say that pursuing a policy of thoughtless isolationism is not only economical suicide for the American worker, it is also callously dismissive of those brave souls in China who are trying to create change and fight for human rights.

We must vote for PNTR today. We must actively work to make our world a better place for our children. We must reach out to the Chinese and attempt to lead them down the right path to embrace our values of democracy, open markets, and human rights. We must help them become a modern nation. The