

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, no one knows exactly why autism strikes approximately 1 in every 500 individuals.

Autism not only has no known cause, but it has, sadly, no known cure. Sadly enough, the national rates of children being diagnosed with autism are increasing dramatically. For example, in the State of California, the numbers have increased 237 percent in the last 10 years. In my home State, 50 percent of the children diagnosed with autism reside within my community of south Florida.

The pictures that I would like to show to my colleagues and to the viewers tonight that we see here are of Bonnie and Willis Flick, two autistic children residing in my Congressional District who are fortunate enough to receive treatment and intervention therapy to help them cope with every day life.

A good day for Bonnie is similar to the one we just heard about Nora. Bonnie is a high functioning autistic child who attends a very special school, The Learning Experience in Miami. And because autism is a spectrum disease that is manifested in a variety of forms, some children are not as high functioning as Bonnie.

□ 2015

For example, life for Bonnie's autistic brother, Willis, is a bit more difficult. Willis is mostly nonverbal and is not able to tell his mother that he is hungry or sleepy or not feeling well. He is unable to verbally express his joy, anger, or frustration; and that makes life all the more difficult for those around him.

Bonnie and Willis receive professional assistance to help them optimize their potential and learning capabilities. But there are many autistic children who are less fortunate.

As if families of autistic children did not suffer enough distress, one of the biggest challenges facing them is finding health coverage for treatment and therapy of this condition.

Fortunately, Nora's parents, as well as Bonnie and Willis' parents, have been able to work through obstacles to ultimately find the care that their families so desperately need.

Many families, however, are not as fortunate. We must continue to work so that all health insurance and health maintenance organizations include coverage for services to treat autism.

In my Congressional district, the University of Miami operates the Center for Autism and Related Diseases, CARD, which helps hundreds of children and their families whose lives are impacted with autism.

The CARD centers operate throughout the State of Florida and provide free individual and family assistance services as well as training programs for the parent and the professional. These centers focus on finding ways to change the behaviors and perceptions of individuals with autism in a way

that will allow them to successfully learn, work, and communicate.

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue to support centers like CARD whose services benefit families struggling through the ordeal of autism.

Last week, the House passed the Children's Health Act, which contains a provision to establish centers of research and expertise. It is establishments like these that will help families of autistic children.

I hope that, on behalf of the Bonnies and the Willises and the Noras in their districts, my colleagues will continue to pass legislation like the Children's Health Act and provide funding to research the causes for this disorder. With continued research, every day we are one day closer to finding a cure for this debilitating disability.

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

(Mr. DOOLEY of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, the vote on permanent normal trade relations with China may be one of the most important votes that we will cast in years.

China represents an agricultural market that is vital to the long-term success of American farmers and ranchers. Agriculture trade with China can strengthen development of private enterprise in this country and bring China more fully into the world trade membership. We intend to work for that goal and urge all of U.S. agriculture to join with us.

China's participation in the WTO will result in at least \$2 billion per year in additional U.S. exports within the next 5 years. That is just U.S. agricultural exports.

By 2005, the largest increases in the annual value of China's net agricultural imports are likely to be \$587 million for corn, \$543 million for wheat, and \$359 million for cotton.

According to the Economic Research Service, net farm income would be higher by \$1.7 billion in 2005 and higher by an average of \$1.1 billion over the years 2000 to 2009 for each year.

Listen to what agricultural groups are saying about China PNTR. The U.S. wheat growers say that PNTR represents a potential 10 percent increase in U.S. wheat exports. The U.S. pork producers believe that China PNTR will pave the way for an increased value in hogs by \$5 a head.

Poultry producers say that because China is already the largest export market for poultry, \$350 million in 1999, under PNTR it can become a \$1 billion market in just a few years.

Cattle producers believe that a vote against PNTR is a vote against them. They expect to almost triple beef export to China by the year 2005.

Corn growers believe that they have an opportunity to immediately triple their 5-year average of corn exports to China with acceptance to PNTR.

Some who oppose PNTR for China will weigh that China is an agricultural glut and will never buy U.S. commodities. That is not true according to USDA's Economic Research Service. They say that China's accession to the WTO means that U.S. farmers and ranchers can sell an additional \$1.6 billion worth of agricultural products in 5 years.

On top of that, \$400 million of U.S. fruits, vegetables, and animal products can be sold by 2005 upon China's entry into the WTO. That is \$2 billion more of agricultural exports in 5 years. This view is supported by the widespread support among U.S. agricultural commodity groups for China PNTR.

Still, others argue that China is self-sufficient in agriculture production and that it produces enough to feed its own people and does not need U.S. wheat or corn or any commodity. But listen to what the Worldwatch Institute Chairman Lester Brown said. He said that China's water supplies in its grain-producing areas are falling at a high rate. He sees massive grain imports and growing dependence on U.S. grain.

The reality is that no one can predict the future. China imports large amounts of U.S. agricultural commodities right now, some through Hong Kong, \$2.5 billion in 1999 of agriculture, fish, and forestry products.

Greater access to Chinese markets means greater opportunities for U.S. high-quality agriculture products. As the diets of the Chinese improve, there will be more demand for high-quality agricultural products and value-added food products. This is what U.S. farmers and the food industry can provide to Chinese consumers.

It must be remembered that China has access to the U.S. market right now. China will become a member of WTO; and after its accession to the WTO, it will still have access to the market. The vote for PNTR will decide whether U.S. agriculture will have improved access to Chinese markets or that we will see that market to the competitors of U.S. agriculture.

We have all heard the argument that PNTR is not necessary and that if Congress rejects China PNTR that U.S. exporters still will attain the benefits of China's WTO accession. But the General Accounting Office says that the full benefits of the November 1999 agreement negotiated by the U.S. will not be available unless Congress adopts China PNTR.

Tariff concessions will be available, but there will be no way to enforce these. No enforcement mechanisms will be available, and the U.S. will not be able to use WTO dispute settlement provisions. The WTO dispute settlement is a critical weapon to ensure U.S. trading rights. The ability to enforce the tariff rate quotas will be undermined. The U.S. could not challenge Chinese export or domestic subsidies that hurt U.S. exports in third countries. We could not enforce the benefits of the sanitary and phytosanitary agreement that was negotiated with the Chinese and is so important to U.S. citrus, wheat, and meat products.

Additionally, the special safeguards provision to protect against import surges negotiated by the U.S. would not be available.

Unless Congress grants China PNTR, there will be no way to ensure that tariff and access concessions will be available to U.S. agricultural exporters. WTO dispute settlement provision will not be available to the U.S. Those who are concerned about making sure China keeps its part of the bargain should support PNTR. Without WTO dispute settlement provisions, any ability to ensure Chinese compliance is severely weakened. According to a May 11, 2000 article in the Washington Post many of China's dissidents back China's accession into the WTO. This is what they are saying:

Bao Tong, one of China's most prominent dissidents, says that Congress should pass China PNTR. Mr. Bao believes that China should be included in as many international regimes as possible so that it must adhere to these international standards. Referring to congressional passage of PNTR, Mr. Bao says, "It is obvious this is a good thing for China." He goes on to say . . . "I appreciate the efforts of friends and colleagues to help our human rights situation, but it doesn't make sense to use trade as a lever. It just doesn't work."

Dai Qing, perhaps China's most prominent environmentalist and independent political thinker, says "All of the fights—for a better environment, labor rights and human rights—these fights we will fight in China tomorrow. But first we must break the monopoly of the state. To do that, we need a freer market and the competition mandated by the WTO." According to Ms. Dai, "One of the main economic and political problems in China today is our monopoly system, a monopoly on power and business monopolies. Both elements are mutually reinforcing. The WTO rules would naturally encourage competition and that's bad for both monopolies.

Zhou Litai, one of China's most prominent labor lawyers and represents dozens of maimed workers in Shenzhen, says, "American consumers are a main catalyst for better worker rights in China. They are the ones who pressure Nike and Reebok to improve working conditions at Hong Kong and Taiwan-run factories here. If Nike and Reebok go—and they could very well (if the trade status) is rejected—this pressure evaporates. This is obvious."

Mr. Speaker, there will be irreparable damage done to American agriculture if Congress does not pass PNTR.

THINK ONCE, THINK TWICE ABOUT U.S. TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to our colleagues this evening, think once, think twice about U.S. trade with China, particularly in agriculture.

Recently I read a fascinating report prepared by Dr. Charles McMillian, former editor of the Harvard Business Review. He is a man who understands numbers. And he says, think once, think twice. China has produced an annual glut of agricultural commodities for over a generation. In fact, the United States has registered a consistent and growing deficit in agriculture with China in two-thirds of all agricultural groupings.

It is true with pork. We produced a lot of that in my corner of Ohio. It is true with corn. It is true with citrus, with vegetables, with fish. Just go down the categories.

China, in fact, in the last decade, had an average annual surplus, that means they are sending more out than taking goods in, in global agricultural trade of \$4 billion annually. Just last year, in 1999, the rate of that is increasing to where just in 1999 they had a \$4 billion surplus of global agricultural trade over what they imported. So their advantage, essentially, is increasing.

They are rapidly expanding the quantity, the quality, and the composition of products that are being exported to our country, everything from ketchup to rice and, for the first time, in 1999, cotton.

Now, China recorded an overall advantage with the United States in 1985, 1986, 1992, 1993, and 1999 in agriculture. In fact, we have maintained a chronic agricultural trade deficit with them in 17 of 26 agricultural commodity groups, everything from seafood, to tobacco, sugar, cocoa, vegetables, fruits, nut, and various animal parts.

What is even more troubling is that our exports to them have fallen every year since 1995 as China has strengthened our ability to export to them in spite of our bilateral agreements and tariff reductions has decreased.

In fact, our agricultural exports to China in 1999 were a third less than a decade before, while U.S. imports of their agricultural commodities had literally doubled, gone up by nearly 100 percent.

Now, if we think about this, China's agricultural production growth continues to outpace their own growth in domestic demand. Our own embassy in China, our agriculture attache in Beijing, points out that China is struggling to solve its fundamental problems of chronic overproduction.

But it does have an inefficient distribution system. And with capital investment that might occur there as a result of going into WTO, they are

going to be able to move that product more quickly around the world.

Particularly key in all of this are China's partnerships with powerful global firms such as Cargill, Archer Daniels Midland, and ConAgra. And of course, those companies export. In fact, Cargill, for example, has been in China since 1973. Cargill really does not care if it sells and markets Chinese corn or U.S. corn.

So the point is there are some agricultural interests globally that will win, but it will not be U.S. farmers because that Chinese corn and pork and tobacco and seafood, and go down all the categories, are going to depress prices even more here at home.

So I would say to people in rural America, think once, think twice about all of this.

It is not clear that, in this recent agreement that the administration signed with China, that any new grain commitments to purchase were actually made. There were some promises that maybe there would be some tariff reduction. But if we look at the tariff reduction that occurred during the decade of the 1990s, it did not result in any more sales.

It is highly unlikely that China will eliminate its non-tariff barriers to agriculture trade. It would put too great a risk on its own sector advancing. Because China, since 1949, has had an agricultural policy that said, we will be food self-sufficient. Starvation propelled them into the most recent half century, and they fully well understand what it means not to be self-sufficient in food production at home.

I think that, as much as we talk about tariffs here and about non-tariff barriers, it is also important to point out that when China gets in trouble internationally, it does something very simple, it devalues its currency, as it did in 1994.

So think once, think twice. China is going to put more downward pressure on U.S. food prices if permanent normal trade relations are approved with China.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on that measure.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the permanent normal trade relations with China.

Some people view PNTR as a gift that the United States would give to China. PNTR with China is, in fact, in the United States' best economic interest.

China is a huge potential market for the United States, as has been mentioned, 1.2 billion people, or 20 percent of the world's population. Our potential to export to them is enormous.

Idaho's share of those exports is significant to a small State with a million