

Well, Mr. Speaker, my hat is off to those university boards. The presidents of those universities, including Gordon Gee of Brown University. They did the right thing for the world, the right thing for America. Their moral courage will stand on its own.

HONORING BERT SNYDER FOR HIS COURAGE IN THE FACE OF DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the Columbine shooting has been the focus of media attention the last few years. It has been difficult during this time not to be reminded of the two young men who devastated a small Colorado town and the entire Nation with violence. The picture of these young killers has been ingrained in many of our minds when we think about today's youth. This is an image that the media continues to foster, and one that I personally find unfortunate.

While I recognize that we do live in a violent society, I also note that there are bright young men and women in every Congressional District across this country who are working to become active and productive members of society. Tonight, I am proud to tell my colleagues about one such individual from my district, the Third District of North Carolina.

I recently attended the Annual Recognition Banquet of the East Carolina Council of the Boy Scouts of America. I had the honor of presenting a very special award to a young man whose bravery and courage in the face of danger should serve as an inspiration to us all.

When I presented Bert his award, I could see the justified pride in his parents, Vern and Jessica Snyder's, eyes, as well as in the eyes of his scout leaders and his fellow boy scouts.

Bert Snyder is a student at Rose High School in Greenville, North Carolina. On May 10 of last year Bert and his friend, Rice Godwin, were driving home from school when they encountered a multi-car accident at an intersection near the high school. The two young men stopped their car at a local convenience store and ran to the scene of the accident. It was evident, as they approached the accident, that one of the drivers involved had suffered a severe injury to her arm and her knee. The passenger in the car had sustained a head injury and appeared to be in a state of unconsciousness.

By the time Bert arrived on the scene, as many as 30 people had already gathered, but, Mr. Speaker, nobody was making an effort to assist the victims. Bert stepped in and ordered a fellow student to call 911. He then assisted the female victim by providing comfort and assurance to help prevent her from going into shock. When he noticed that

she was losing a significant amount of blood from the injury to her arm, he removed his own shirt and applied pressure to the site. Bert continued his efforts to stop the bleeding even after firemen arrived at the scene. Only when rescue personnel with the EMS unit arrived did Bert break from his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, Bert Snyder placed himself in a potentially unknown and threatening situation to help someone in need. When onlookers did not take action, he stepped in and offered reassurance and emergency assistance. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, as an adult, if I would have been prepared enough or secure enough in my abilities to assist in a similar emergency situation with the same confidence and assertiveness as Bert.

As a result of his courage and bravery, Bert was honored with the National Heroism Award at the award ceremony. The award was presented to Bert on the recommendation of the National Court of Honor because he demonstrated heroism and skill in saving or attempting to save a life at risk to self.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honor for me to present Bert with this important recognition. It was also a joy to attend the awards banquet and to be reminded of the number of young men and women who are working with organizations like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts to gain the values and leadership skills that will help lead this country into our future. Too often these bright young people do not receive the media attention they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Bert Snyder for his courage and his commitment to his fellow man. Bert exemplifies the young men and women in our society who have the character and leadership skills to lead this country and tomorrow's future.

I want Bert to know how proud I am to have the opportunity to represent him and his family in the House of Representatives and to share his important story with this Nation. Bert Snyder is a member of today's youth who can make us all proud. I applaud his efforts and the efforts of every young person today who is working to make a difference within their communities.

Bert Snyder, America's future is bright because of young people like you throughout this Nation. We thank you for your courage.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, listening to my distinguished colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) speaking earlier about the potential permanent normal trade relations vote that we will have

on China soon reminded me that any opportunity I get I should come to the floor. And since there is an opportunity now, I thought I should take this 5 minutes.

As my colleagues know, President Clinton has sent a request for Congress asking this Congress to yield permanent normal trade relations with China. He bases that request on a U.S.-China bilateral agreement signed in 1999. He bases that request also on a history of absolutely noncompliance on the part of China of any trade agreements they have ever signed with the U.S., be they trade agreements for market access of U.S. products into China's market, be they trade agreements on intellectual property violations by the Chinese, be they trade agreements on use of prison labor for export, China year in and year out continues to violate these agreements, and now the President has said, the Chinese will honor this one.

Well, they are already backing off this one. In fact, in two areas of agriculture, of particular note I think to this body, the Chinese have a different interpretation. They are famous for reinterpreting treaties and agreements. For example, on the subject of wheat, the U.S. Trade Rep's factsheet says that wheat and grain, therefore, will be allowed into China. The Chinese Trade Rep says, any idea that the grain will enter the country of China is a misunderstanding. Beijing merely conceded a theoretical opportunity.

On the subject of meat, the Trade Rep's factsheet talks about meat and poultry, all forms, being allowed into China. The Chinese Trade Rep says, not so, not quite. He says diplomacy is a way of finding different forms of expression, and to that extent we found new expressions, we were diplomatic, but where there were no material concessions made.

So on the basis of a flimsy 1999 U.S.-China trade agreement, in which, by the way, there was little attention paid, practically none, to enforcement, compliance or implementation, the President is asking this body to surrender to the dictates of the regime in Beijing permanently any leverage that we have on trade and, indeed, human rights and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as well.

Even if we could put aside for a moment, Mr. Speaker, the brutal occupation of Tibet, the ongoing repression of human rights in China, the continuing proliferation of weapons, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons of mass destruction to rogue states, to Pakistan, the ongoing relationship between the Chinese and the Pakistanis in terms of missile technology transfer, same thing with Iran, more recently with Libya, since this 1999 U.S.-China trade agreement they have proliferated to Libya, the administration does not want that known, but it is in the public domain, so in any event, we have many areas of concern. But even if we were to make a determination strictly on

the basis of trade alone, there is no reason for us to permanently surrender our leverage.

□ 1945

It is as if the U.S. wants to trade with China in the worst possible way, and that is exactly what the President is leading us to do in the worst possible way.

There is a better way. All the President needs to do is send a request to Congress for a special waiver for China to have normal trade relations for one more year, as he does every end of May. There does not even have to be a vote on that. We do not have to have the debate. We do not have to have a vote. No one has to go on record.

In the course of the next year, if the Chinese begin for a change, a drastic change, to start honoring the commitments, they do not have to do everything. In the agreement that would not be possible, but at least to take the initial steps to honor the agreement. Then next year around this time there should be no problem with saying, all right, they honored the commitment on trade, and the WTO is a trade regiment, so on the basis of trade alone, this might work for us.

I do not know why everybody is so afraid to do it in the normal course of events. Because if we believe that China is going to honor the agreement, they should have no problem with that.

The other reason that is important is because China has not even made its agreement with the European Union. And we are not supposed to see this arrangement, we are not supposed to even be voting on this until the Chinese reach an agreement with the other members of the WTO. So, effectively, the President is asking us to vote on something that we do not know what the terms are because they have not negotiated them with the EU yet.

What the President is asking us to do is give privileges to China permanently before they ever have to honor any commitments to the WTO. Indeed, they have not even reached the agreement to join the WTO.

What the President is asking us to do is for each of us to put our good names next to his failed China policy and try to redeem it with this rush to surrender permanently to the dictators in Beijing, thereby squandering our leverage on trade, squandering our leverage on our values, and surrendering our leverage on national security.

So I would hope that our colleagues would pay attention and ask the question, where is the implementation, where is the compliance, where is the enforcement on this, and where are our national values on this?

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSING MASSIVE REDUCTION IN STRATEGIC FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full hour. But I do rise to discuss a matter of vital importance, following the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), on issues relating to national security.

There are some in both parties who are concerned that, perhaps, we are rushing to try to create a new legacy for this President on foreign policies relative to our policies with China and Russia.

As someone who spends a great deal of time focusing on both of those countries as a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services and Chairman of the Committee on Military Research and Development and co-chairman of the inter-parliamentary dialogue between Russia and the U.S., I am extremely concerned about not just our relationship with China, which I will have more to say later on this week and next week relative to the NTR vote, but specifically to our relationship with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the first week of June the President will take an historic trip to Moscow, where he has been asked to address the Duma, which is kind of an historic event, an American President being asked to speak before the lower house of the Russian Parliament.

I applaud the President for going to Moscow. I am concerned, however, that the election of Putin as the new President of Russia saw him take his first trip not to Washington, not to the West. But his first trip, in fact, is to Beijing, where he is, in fact, engaged in a series of high-level meetings with the leadership of China.

In fact, both China and Russia have talked about a new strategic partnership, one that would include China and Russia against the West and, in particular, against the U.S.

Now, it is important that we reach out to this new leader in Russia. I did the day that he was sworn into office on January 11 in a three-page letter that I wrote in Russian to him talking about the need for us to sit down and work together to build, once again, a solid relationship between our two countries.

But I am extremely concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the President's upcoming trip in June; and I want to call my concerns to the attention of our colleagues and to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is not that we do not want our President to go to Moscow. We do. And we do want him to discuss issues that are important between our two countries. And, obviously, reducing the threat of the massive buildup of arms that we both engaged in during the Cold War has got to be our top priority.

But, Mr. Speaker, many of us on both sides of the aisle are equally concerned that this President not rush to a quick judgment in our relations with Russia

or China that would cause America to, in the end, be more insecure and would cause more destabilizing relations between us and those two nations.

Now, why do I raise these concerns today? Because, Mr. Speaker, last week it was brought to my attention by quiet conversations brought to me from both the Pentagon and the intelligence service that the President had ordered the Pentagon to look at a massive reduction in our strategic forces.

In fact, one individual told me that the President himself had ordered a presidential nuclear initiative that would, in fact, cut our strategic forces by 50 percent and that this initiative would be announced as a part of the President's trip to Moscow.

Now, why is that critically important? Mr. Speaker, as we both know, the strategic stability between us and Russia is based on an outdated theory called "mutually assured destruction," where neither side dares challenge the other for fear of retaliation. We do not have a defensive system to defeat a Russian accidental launch. Although, the Russians do have a defense system around Moscow.

So when we negotiate with the Russians in terms of reducing arms, it is critically important that our Pentagon, that our military leaders, that our strategic thinkers in our Government, not Republican or Democrat thinkers, but career thinkers who are paid to protect America, be consulted in terms of what the final outcome of negotiations should be.

What I heard last week, Mr. Speaker, which was reported in at least three major newspapers in both Chicago, New York, and Washington on Thursday, was that the administration is, in fact, proposing massive reductions in our strategic forces in terms of our relations with Russia.

Now, why am I concerned about that? I do want to see us reduce our strategic forces and our reliance on them, but I want to do it in a logical and methodical manner. This administration, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately does not have a good track record in negotiating treaties that can get the bipartisan support of the Congress. This administration, in fact, has a terrible reputation in terms of our foreign policy in general.

Many of our colleagues talk, for instance, frequently about the President's comments before he went into Kosovo and declared that we would see hundreds of thousands of mass graves from where Milosevic had buried the people he had murdered. Well, after that war was, in fact, wound down this year, we had the CIA before our committee and I asked the CIA how many mass graves did we find. They said well below 10,000; and some of those graves may have actually been wounds inflicted by the allied forces in their attempts to remove Milosevic from power.

So while the President said one thing to get the support of the American people to go into Kosovo, which he promised us would last only a matter of