translate the excellent basic research in Alzheimer's Disease to the clinic. Ultimately this program provides an opportunity for the National Institute on Aging (NIA) to "enhance efforts to train, and educate health care professionals to improve diagnosis, treatment and prevention of Alzheimer's Disease" as the House Report language accompanying this bill urges.

I would note that the Senate Committee report accompanying the Labor-HHS Education Appropriations bill provides additional clarification of the intent of Congress with respect to how funds will be used to improve the diagnosis, treatment and prevention of Alzheimer's Disease. The Senate Committee Report states the following with respect to the specific steps we expect to be taken to educate and train physician/scientists:

"The Committee believes that an important step in fighting Alzheimer's Disease is the encouragement of clinical research and training, which will complement the many excellent research efforts currently funded through the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Institute on Aging (NIA), and in the private sector. The creation of Alzheimer's Clinical Research and Training Awards program to train physicians to recognize and treat Alzheimer's Disease, and to dedicate their careers to improving care for Alzheimer's patients by bridging the gap that exists between basic and clinical research is critical. The awards program will foster physician dedication to a career in research, diagnosis, and treatment of Alzheimer's Disease by awarding junior and midlevel physicians who have demonstrated the potential for a lifetime commitment to the long-term care and treating Alzheimer's, with a 1 year stipend to train as an Alzheimer's physician/scientist. The awards program will be administered through the NIA, and should provide support for institutions focused primarily on Alzheimer's research but linked to a clinical treatment facility. The awards program will complement the Alzheimer's Disease Research Centers (currently funded through NIA) or similar institutions that are State or privately funded. The awards program will encourage institutions implementing the program to specialize in training physician/scientists, ultimately becoming "Alzheimer Centers." Alzheimer's disease is on track to become the epidemic of the 21st Century, currently 4 million Americans are afflicted and by 2050 it is estimated that this number will increase to 14 million. With these astonishing statistics we must act today to head off the health care crisis of tomorrow. The Alzheimer's Clinical Research and Training Awards envisioned by both the House and Senate bills represent an important step in meeting the challenge.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today I voted "yea" on roll call vote 234, "yea" on roll call vote 235, "yea" on roll call 236, and "yea" on roll call vote 237.

IN MEMORY OF WILLIAM (BILL) H. HAMANN

HON. IKE SKELTTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SKELTTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I inform the House of the death of Bill Hamann, former resident of Lexington, Missouri. He was 87.

Bill, a son of the late William G. and Mary Curtis Hamann, was born in Henrietta, Missouri, on October 12, 1912. His dedication to football began on the Richmond High School football team and continued at Graceland Junior College in Lamoni, Iowa, where he also lettered in basketball. His greatest satisfaction as a player was playing center for the Missouri University Tigers under coach Don Faurot. A special influence in his life.

After graduation, Bill coached football at Odessa High School for two years before joining the Army during the World War II. He served in the Navy until November 1945, making lieutenant before he returned to Missouri University to complete his master's degree.

In 1946, Bill moved to Lexington and began coaching football earned at Lexington High School. In his first year, he led the team to their first undefeated season in Lexington history. He was head coach football for 22 years, winning four more Missouri River Valley Conference (MRVC) championships. Bill also served as Athletic Director, basketball coach and track coach during this time. He was head basketball coach for six years and assistant basketball coach for ten years, winning one MRVC championship. Bill also had great success as a track coach, winning State meets twice and numerous District and MRVC championships. He was one of a select few Missouri coaches who won championships in three major sports for one school. Bill retired from coaching football in 1968, but continued to coach track until 1972. In addition to coaching, he taught driver's education, physical education and history. He retired from teaching in 1979 after 32 years at Lexington High School.

Bill was one of the first coaches named to the Missouri High School Hall of Fame in 1992, and as Hall of Fame Coach for Track in 1993. He is one of only two coaches named in more than one Hall of Fame in all of Missouri.

Bill also served as President of the MRVC, was twice honored as Coach of the Year at the Kansas City Area Night of Sports, and was twice honored as Coach of the Year at the MRVC.

Bill was one of only two coaches named to the Missouri High School Hall of Fame in 1992, and as Hall of Fame Coach for Track in 1993. He is one of only two coaches named in more than one Hall of Fame in all of Missouri.

Bill also served as President of the MRVC, was twice honored as Coach of the Year at the Kansas City Area Night of Sports, and was named a life member of the West Central Coaches Association. He received the Distinguished Service Award from the Missouri Athletic Administration. Bill was President of the Lafayette County Teachers and a member of Phi Delta Kappa at Central Missouri State University. He was a former president and member of the Lexington Retired Teachers. Additionally, Bill was a member of the Lions Club, Kiwanis Club, and very active in the Lexington Historical Society. He was a member of the United Methodist Church of Lexington and served as Chairman of the Church Board.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Hamann will be greatly missed by all who knew him. I know the Members of the House will join me in extending heartfelt condolences to his family: his wife of 58 years, Betty; his daughter, Sally; his two sons, James and John; his two brothers, Herbert and Charles, and four grandchildren.

CELEBRATION OF LOU TREBAR ON HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate Mr. Lou Trebar. On Wednesday May 3, 2000, this Cleveland polka legend celebrated his 80th birthday with 1,500 of his closest friends. Gathered at the Slovenian National Home, thousands of polka fans and eighteen polka bands payed tribute to this local artist by giving him "the greatest day of [his] life."

Throughout Lou's life, he has made significant contributions to Cleveland's culturally diverse community. This Slovenian neighborhood native has enhanced Northeast Ohio's culture, and has added to the quality that makes Cleveland a polka city. Lou has a lifetime of dedication to promoting Cleveland-style polkas and waltzes and to preserving the rich Slovenian heritage from which Cleveland evolved.

This "Waltz King" is a true dean of Cleveland-style music. He was a pioneer in adapting Slovenian folk music into America's musical mainstream as the first Cleveland-style bandleader to create a multi-part harmony with all types of instruments. His vision and talent have greatly decorated the heritage of the Cleveland area.

I salute Lou for these many artistic accomplishments, and I join in with his many fans who wish him a happy 80th birthday.

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

SPEECH OF
HON. BOB CLEMENT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, since the President asked Congress to grant Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China, the members of this body—indeed, all of the American people—have been forced to consider broad questions about our relationship with China, about our values as a free people and about our fundamental best interests as they relate to the economy and to national security. These are very serious questions; and I—like many of my colleagues, I am sure—have invested a great deal of time in study, discussions and prayer about them.

Make no mistake—I understand the value of international trade, and I am a believer in developing trade opportunities to enhance our economic future. I recognize the realities of the global economy that exist today; and there is no doubt in my mind that trade is the key to the future for the United States, for China and for every other nation as well. My record reflects my belief in free and fair trade policies, including trade with China. I supported
China’s recent provocative actions and continued demand for Taiwan to acknowledge its “one China” policy or expect military actions is troubling. Should we reward China for these actions? I believe we would be sending exactly the wrong message if we were to grant China permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) when there are serious national security concerns and Taiwan’s role in the U.S.-China relationship as well as China’s role in producing and disseminating weapons of mass destruction. When China’s record of compliance with past agreements leaves much to be desired. And when China’s progress in economic power and technological development has overestimated progress on human rights and religious freedom. Therefore, I am not convinced that the best interests of this nation and of the people of my state are served by rewarding China with unconditional permanent normal trade relations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to extending PNTR to China at this time.

Rather than granting PNTR, I believe a more prudent and responsible approach is to continue an annual review of China’s trade status. In the past, as a supporter of free trade, I have favored granting normal trade relations to China on an annual basis. In this way, we have better opportunities to move that country toward a more democratic, free market system, while maintaining a trade relationship that certainly can be beneficial to the people of both nations. I see this annual review as an effective way to influence the Chinese government to reform its policies toward religious minorities, workers, and proponents of democracy.

But granting permanent status to China is a significantly different issue. Such a move would, in a sense, take China “off probation” and remove the incentive to make progress on those issues of particular concern to the United States. In my opinion, the question the PNTR vote poses is not on the merits of free trade but rather whether the U.S. should relinquish our influence on trade with China permanently.

NATIONAL SECURITY

My first concern about our relationship with China relates to national security. The prospects for peace and prosperity in Asia depend heavily on China’s role as a responsible member of the international community. Perhaps our country’s most important national security challenge is to build a constructive and stable bilateral relationship with China. The prospects for peace and prosperity in Asia depend heavily on China’s role as a responsible member of the international community. In my opinion, a policy must be built on a foundation of strength and resolve that rewards responsible Chinese behavior and confronts provocative activities that undermine U.S. interests and promote greater risks of military and diplomatic confrontation.

Should we continue the relationship with China with PNTR status given recent highly provocative actions on the part of the Chinese government? Our country would be sending exactly the wrong message if we were to support China’s WTO membership with PNTR at a time when the Chinese have chosen to adopt a far more aggressive stance toward Taiwan, a stance that they could lead to a serious military confrontation with the U.S.
will retain the ability of Congress to examine China’s willingness and ability to keep its commitments. It will give China incentive to improve its record with regard to workers’ rights and human rights and give it an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

A RECENT CONCERNS

To some degree, the Chinese government has avoided full compliance with many of the trade agreements it has made with the United States. While our trade deficit with China continues to grow, China has broken its agreements with us on opening markets, stopping the piracy of intellectual property, and ending the export of goods produced in the forced labor camps. The statements of China’s negotiators on PNTR lead me to believe that we cannot count on a total, good-faith compliance with this agreement, either.

This pattern of non-compliance, or of only partial compliance, bolster significantly the argument against PNTR and in favor of the annual renewals that have been granted in the past. The U.S.-China trade relationship with China altogether would be a foolish and self-destructive for the United States, losing our annual review and any subsequent leverage to move.

In any number of areas—agricultural commodities, meat and poultry, telecommunications, petroleum, insurance-related services, and others—American interests are best served when we can revisit compliance issues regularly. With PNTR, our opportunities to monitor and influence compliance are severely limited, if not eliminated, while an annual review with the United States and China is the only avenue to examine China’s willingness and ability to keep its commitments.

CONCLUSION

A “no” vote on PNTR will not mean an end to America’s trade relationship with China. The U.S. and China will continue to have a binding trade relationship under international law, governed by the 1979 trade agreement between our two countries and several subsequent bilateral deals. The “most favored nation” provisions of those agreements require that China afford the United States any trade and non-trade economic benefits that China grants to our competitors. It is true that the U.S. would not be able to file complaints against China through the WTO dispute resolution process. However, we will retain the right to use our own laws to sanction China—by withholding or limiting access to the U.S. market—for unfair trade practices.

Furthermore, if the U.S. and China are not tied through the WTO, we will be able to use our trade laws to redress abuses of human rights. Just as with trade, the U.S. would be prohibited from taking such actions if China and the U.S. have a WTO relationship. So China’s lack of PNTR status allows us annual reviews of China’s progress, thus giving China an incentive to improve its record with regard to workers’ rights and human rights and give it an opportunity to demonstrate its adherence to fair trade and environmental protection.

There is no doubt in my mind that trade is the key to the future. Opening markets benefit everyone—by allowing U.S. gains in new destinations to export goods and China gains investment from foreign companies. In my opinion, the question this PNTR vote poses is not on the merits of free trade but rather whether the U.S. should relinquish our influence on trade with China permanently. International trade—and the benefits it affords—are a fact. Likewise, it should also not be disputed as to whether the United States should attempt to influence Chinese behavior in areas of human and workers’ rights, weapons proliferation and compliance with international commitments. Clearly we should. Thus, my concern lies with whether we should take China off the one-year renewal process. Given current conditions in China and recent actions by the Chinese government, I am not convinced that relinquishing this leveraging tool is in our best national interest at this time.

It is for all of these reasons that I must oppose permanent normal trade relations at this time. I am not convinced that it is in the best interest of Tennesseans and our country to reward China with unconditional permanent normal trade relations when it is clear they do not meet our standards for human and worker rights and could threaten our national security. Clearly trade must continue and we must pledge ourselves to work with the Chinese reformers to move their country towards free market democracy. However, until significant improvements are made in these areas, I cannot in good faith vote to grant PNTR.

I look forward to the day when China fully joins the international community in a commitment to democratic values, human rights, and trade that is truly free and fair. Until that time, we have a duty to use whatever tools we have available to us to influence China to take that path. My vote against PNTR for China is one such tool, and I utilize it in good conscience and with a conviction that it will benefit both the Chinese and American people.

TRIBUTE TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE S.P.H.E.R.E.S. PROJECT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend John Link, Amy Rahe, Carmen Reiner, and Adam Wieties. These four middle school students from Carlinville Middle School in Carlinville, IL, are tackling tough community issues as participants in the S.P.H.E.R.E.S Award for Community Innovation.

Their project is Saving Prairies and Helping Environmental Regions Expand Successfully—S.P.H.E.R.E.S. Through this project they have successfully strengthened local support to create a preserve where native prairie grasses and indigenous creatures could flourish and students could study and experience the prairie habitat.

I want to take this opportunity to thank these students who at such a young age have made it their responsibility to preserve our environment. I am proud of them and look forward to all else they may accomplish.

TRIBUTE TO AKIRA INOUE

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD
OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, Each year, the Guam Chamber of Commerce selects the “Small Business Person of the Year” from a pool of individuals and business partners who either own and operate or bear principal responsibility for small business establishments on Guam. The chamber takes into account staying power, sales growth, growth in payroll, innovativeness in product or service, response to adversity, and civic contributions. This year the honor was bestowed upon local businessman, Akira Inoue.

Having held assignments in Australia, New Guinea, Saipan and other neighboring islands, Akira chose to settle on Guam, an island he deemed to be the ideal hub for Japanese-oriented businesses. On September 1, 1968, he established Nanbo Guan Co., Ltd. Initially engaged in the importation and wholesale of general merchandise from Japan, Nanbo Guan started underwriting insurance in June of 1969.

Having no previous experience nor training in the insurance business, Akira assumed the function of general agent for The Tokio Marine and Fire Insurance Co., Ltd., of Japan. The company enjoyed a steady growth and, with it, the...