

message this morning is that we have to rely on scientific information as we pursue our scientific endeavors and not allow emotion and fear profiteers to determine the destiny of research and scientific achievement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the payoffs from plant genome research will depend in large part on our ability to capture and apply the benefits from it. Congress should support the goals of the plant genome research. The National Plant Genome Initiative is a well-managed public asset that represents a wise use of taxpayer dollars.

Current sequencing efforts on *Arabidopsis thaliana* have improved immeasurably our understanding of the genomics of a typical flowering plant. The shift in emphasis from gene sequencing to functional genomics is the logical next step that should provide the intellectual basis for new varieties of commercially-important crops and other plants.

NSF, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the other participants in the plant genome program have done a credible job of making the results of the research it funds available to other researchers and the private sector. Partnerships among universities participating in the program, agricultural experiment stations, and private-sector companies also have been developed.

These efforts should be encouraged further, and more formal structures concentrating research efforts in plant genomics, plant breeding, and agricultural extension should be considered to attract increased private sector participation and get new varieties to the field sooner. To that end, I would hope that the plant genome and gene expression centers pilot program authorized in H.R. 3500, through its matching-funds requirement, will be used by NSF to encourage greater participation of other federal agencies, particularly USDA, and the private sector in accelerating the development of enhanced food crops, particularly those that provide nutritional or health benefits to consumers, and for alternative uses of agricultural crops.

Please join me this Thursday at a press and staff briefing on biotechnology and "Fear Profiteers." A timely discussion of the importance of sound science in policy approaches to biotechnology, other areas of science and case studies of organizations and businesses that sow health scares to reap membership and/or monetary gain. September 21, 2000, 11:30–12:30 p.m., 1302 Longworth Building, Representative NICK SMITH (R-MI); Fred Smith, Competitive Enterprise Institute; Bonner Cohen, Ph.D., Lexington Institute; Alex Avery, Hudson Institute; Emceed by Steve Milloy, Publisher of junkscience.com.

#### PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment that the Senate has approved permanent normal trade relations with China, which the President will soon sign.

Contrary to the cheers heard from private industry, this is not a moment

of celebration for millions of hard-working American men and women. In fact, American workers in specific industries are watching their jobs disappear. We have sacrificed their livelihood on the alter of trade with China. These are working people who will soon see their jobs exported overseas. In New Jersey, we will lose 22,000 jobs over the next 10 years.

Upon enactment of PNTR, the United States is caving in to pressure from private industry and turning a blind eye to the Chinese Government's flagrant shortcomings. I did not vote for PNTR when it was considered in the House because an affirmative vote was one that would legitimize the actions of a government known for terrorizing its citizens, disallowing free speech and religion, and for breaking every trade agreement they have made with the United States.

Increased trade with China will not force the reform and democracy in their deeply flawed government. We have given them a pink slip, our workers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern and disappointment that the Senate has approved Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, which the President will soon sign into law.

Contrary to the cheers heard from private industry, this is not a moment of celebration for millions of hard working American men and women who will get the short end of the stick. PNTR is a bad deal for the United States and its people.

I am ashamed to tell the men and women in my district, the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, that this bill passed Congress. These are working people, who will soon see their jobs exported overseas. New Jersey will lose over 22 thousand jobs over the next ten years upon enactment of this bill.

Furthermore, upon enactment of PNTR, the United States is caving in to pressure from private industry and turning a blind eye to the Chinese government's flagrant shortcomings.

I did not vote for China PNTR when it was considered in the House because an affirmative vote was one that would legitimize the actions of a government known for terrorizing its citizens, disallowing free speech and religion, and for breaking every trade agreement with the United States.

Increased trade with China will not foster reform and democracy in their deeply flawed government. Instead, it will lead America into trade deficits, as has been proven in normal trade relations agreements in the past. Most importantly, I am disappointed that the American worker was not well represented in this Congress.

Instead of ensuring that hard working American families are secure in their jobs so that they can put food on their table, clothes on their backs, and pay their mortgage, the Congress has just handed them a pink slip.

I applaud the attempts of some of my colleagues in the Senate who tried to offer remedies to this flawed bill, but were rebuffed with each and every attempt. I was disappointed that constructive amendments—amendments dealing with labor standards, human rights, weapons technology and policy toward Taiwan—were rejected. I try to remain optimistic

about the prospects for our future. But I am continually discouraged from optimism when I watch the textile industry in my district vanish before my very eyes.

How can the workers in my District be optimistic when they are looking for work in trades that will no longer be based in the United States? Right before the House took the vote on China PNTR, workers in my district held a rally against passage. The site? A textile company that had closed down because jobs have been exported overseas slowly, but surely.

Workers, businessmen, students and veterans were all in attendance at the rally, united against this trade policy that will be enacted soon after I speak here today. The opposition I stood with that day was a broad coalition of patriots. They would like us to export our values before our jobs.

This trade agreement is nothing more than corporate welfare. We are paving the way for multinational corporations to exploit low-wage workers without fear of human rights violations for working conditions.

After all, workers in China are not protected by their government. There are no unions, no freedoms, no whistle-blowing, no legal recourse for inhumane conditions, no freedom of speech . . . the list goes on and on.

I will never surrender my moral compass, and that the only thing I want to be permanent between the United States and China is a commitment to freedom. I vehemently oppose the passage of China PNTR, and will continue to fight on behalf of American laborers in the future. God bless America.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Mr. CANADY of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear

hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EDUCATION FUNDING PRIORITIES

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker I would like to take some time here this afternoon to talk about education in furtherance of the discussion we just had and the votes we have just had on the floor of the House of Representatives.

In a time when education has risen to be the number one issue in all of the polls that we see across America, everyone is trying to take credit for what is happening in education, or to blame others. In reality, I do not think there is a man or woman on either side of this Chamber who would not want to, in some way, be able to help young people with education.

Mr. Speaker, I like to believe very strongly that we on the Republican side have worked very, very hard to further this purpose, just as we did on the last vote, trying to take the same amount of money and giving flexibility to the States and local districts to make the decision about how to use the money and not mandate just school construction or just reduced class size.

Similarly, we have been working very hard on the funding aspects of education. Indeed, as I indicated in our discussion earlier today, in the first 5 years of the last decade, with the Democrats in charge of the House of Representatives, the increase in funding for education was 6 percent per year. Basically, it was 6 percent in the 5 years the Democrats were in charge of the House, and when the Republicans took over, the increase has been 8.2 percent a year. Anyone who knows anything about mathematics and takes that 2.2 percent additional increase each year realizes how many dollars that amounts to. So there has been no shirking of the responsibility of Republicans with respect to education.

But I think just as important have been some of the issues that underlie this. We have been very determined to help children with disabilities, to help with IDEA, the individuals with disabilities education act. They need particular help because, in some cases, it is particularly expensive to help those young people be educated.

We have been concerned about quality. We have talked about quality effectiveness and results in education. We have talked about better teaching. In our classrooms today, particularly today with the technology and some of the problems in society, we need teachers who are competent and who are

well trained and, in particular, who know their subject matter. We need accountability. As we are deregulating more Federal education programs and providing more flexibility, which we have been doing, we must ensure that Federal education programs produce real accountable results.

We believe in local control. Ultimately, we have to make that decision, be it Washington State or Washington, D.C. or Wilmington, Delaware or some place around the United States of America, we need to give them the flexibility to do what they have to do in order to educate. We need to get dollars to the classroom. We have been pushing very hard to make sure that the appropriations which are done here go into the classrooms to help the young people get educated.

Basic academics is important. No more fads or self-esteem approaches, perhaps new math, open classrooms, some of the things which have failed over the years. We need the basic academics, and we do need parental involvement and responsibility. I think all of us are aware that parents are often out of the house more because of the need for income, jobs, matters like that, but the bottom line is that we need to get parents as involved as we possibly can.

□ 1430

We have been working very hard in order to get that done, and we have been providing the funding for this, and I think that is a significant point that needs to be made.

There are a lot of areas we have been involved in: the Charter School Expansion Act; some real opportunities to educate differently, perhaps better; prohibiting new Federal taxes, for example; dealing with the Teacher Empowerment Act and the Student Result Act. These are all areas of building for education for young people across America.

But there are other areas as well, and some are not necessarily connected to what Republicans do. One is called Head Start. Head Start is a very significant program that helps young people who may need a particular start in education to get up to the starting line equal. I like to believe that every kid in kindergarten at the age of 5 is going to be equal at that point if we can possibly help with that.

And Republicans have been leading the way over the last few years with Head Start. Funding for this program has expanded by 106 percent since 1995. That is a tremendous increase. That is a real commitment, to take all of those children who may come from families or circumstances where they need some extra help and provide that extra help to them.

At the same time, we are talking again about quality and not just quantity, and we are saying that those people who are in these Head Start programs, that is teaching and running them, should have the background to do that. Hopefully, they will be teachers or people on their way to a teaching degree so that they will have the

advantages of knowing exactly how they can handle children. So we are working on that. And now half the people teaching in Head Start have a college degree. There is a balance, I think, between quality and expansion, which is going on here; and we think that is important as well.

We think quality child care is important also. A great sum of money has been spent with respect to the area of helping with our children. Again, children are the future. Children are a precious commodity that we have to pay a great deal of attention to as Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Literacy is also important. And under the tutelage of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the retiring but extraordinarily talented chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we have also addressed these issues. So there are many, many things which we have done with respect to education for which the Republican Party may take credit, as well as some Democrats may take credit.

The bottom line is that we care a great deal about education. We have funded education and we want to make sure all those children have every opportunity possible.

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

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

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, I led an hour of debate on the topic of prescription drug coverage for senior citizens. I read three letters from around the state from seniors who shared their personal stories. On the 12th, I made a commitment to continue to read a different letter every week until the House enacts reform. That was five months ago. Although the House passed a prescription drug bill this summer, I believe it will not help most seniors. So, I will continue to submit letters until Congress enacts a real Medicare prescription drug benefit. This week, I will submit a letter from Virginia Langell of Chippewa Lake, Michigan.

At most, there are only three weeks left for Congress to enact a meaningful prescription drug benefit. It is critical that we do so before Congress adjourns.

This week, Newsweek magazine has devoted its cover story to the issue of prescription drugs. It is the same story that I have been sharing on the House floor since April.