

Yates became involved with local issues as a member of the Fiesta Gardens Homes Association, and was later president of the umbrella organization, San Mateo United Homeowners Association.

He served as mayor in 1996 and would have held the office again next year.

Yates was remembered by his colleagues on the council as a mediator who could disagree without rancor and always had the community's best interests in mind.

He respected the council's decisions, even when votes didn't go his way.

He was also a strong advocate for public safety, pushing for Advanced Life Support paramedic services countywide and convincing city residents to pass a bond measure funding seismic retrofits at the police and fire stations.

Today, when lots of cities can't even get enough candidates together to hold a contested council election, and many residents are too busy with work and family to get involved in local issues, someone with Yates' dedication to civic life is rare indeed.

Gary Yates will be missed most by his wife, Linda, and his children, Jeff, Dana and Alicia. But the loss echoes throughout San Mateo, which has one less leader and advocate.

---

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

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 24, 2000*

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, although I am for free and fair trade, as well as engagement with China, now is not the time for Permanent NTR.

Like many of my colleagues, I look at all trade agreements on an individual basis and weigh their positives and negatives accordingly.

For example, I support United States participation in the World Trade Organization and I supported annual NTR because I believe it is important to engage China. However, I opposed the Africa/CBI trade deal because it was bad for American workers and did not contain enough protections from potential trade related job losses to mitigate the impact it would have on American employees and my constituents in New York.

For me, this debate is not about engagement or isolation. I am opposed to PNTR because it is the wrong time to make permanent China's trade benefits with the United States.

China, has simply not matured enough politically or economically to have permanent normal trade relations with the United States.

China has a record of gross human rights violations, including the use of prison labor and a lack of religious freedom and it still poses a danger to our national security. China also has a terrible record on the environment and has some of the most polluted cities in the world.

Last year, 1999, was the worst year for religious freedom in China since the Cultural

Revolution of the late 60's, according to the U.S. Commission on Human Rights. In China, numerous religious and human rights groups have suffered severe repression, including Catholics and the Falun Gong. No wonder religious leaders and human rights groups are opposed to PNTR, including the U.S. Catholic Conference.

Even the State Department Report on Human Rights contains tough criticism of Beijing's increased repression of democracy activists and religious groups such as Tibetan Buddhists and Chinese Christians. The report states that religious services were broken up while church leaders were harassed, detained, beaten and tortured.

Prison labor continues to be a problem in China as well. The Laogai Research Foundation has documented nearly 1,100 forced labor camps in China. In these prison camps, laborers receive no compensation for their work, conditions are appalling, and beatings are common.

China also continues to pose a threat to our national security and the security of our allies in the region, especially Taiwan.

We know that China sells weapons and weapons technology to countries like Libya, Sudan and Iran. It should come as no surprise that veterans groups such as the American Legion and the Order of the Purple Heart are against this agreement because of the national security implications.

Economic arguments are another good reason to oppose this agreement.

Despite what PNTR proponents are saying, the economic benefits of this deal are overstated. We already have Normal Trade Relations with China, which have resulted in a large and growing trade deficit.

United States imports from China more than tripled in real terms between 1992 and 1999, and the United States trade deficit with China increased 256 percent to \$68 billion in 1999 (in 1999 dollars). While China runs a huge trade surplus with the United States, it has a sizeable trade deficit with the rest of the world.

The existing trade deficit with China is the product of current United States trade policies. The United States already accepts 40 percent of China's exports. By giving China PNTR status, Congress will be giving up America's most effective tool for changing those policies. Without the ability to negotiate directly with China, the deficit with China will surely grow and United States job losses as a result of the deficit will mount.

The Chinese also have a bad track record when it comes to adhering to existing agreements.

China has violated every trade agreement it has made with the United States over the last 10 years. The Chinese government has broken agreements on opening its markets, stopping the piracy of intellectual property and ending the export of slave labor-produced goods.

The U.S. response, create a monitoring group. But, by creating a monitoring group the the Administration is undermining its own argument that, by joining the WTO, China will begin to comply with the rules.

We already know that China has not and will not comply with their agreements. How will a powerless monitoring group help?

Unless there is a mechanism that will punish China for its continued violations of human rights, its poor labor record, its environmental excesses and its religious persecution, it will not do enough to help the situation. A monitoring group, or the Commission created under this legislation is a nice idea.

I commend my colleagues, Congressmen SANDER LEVIN and DOUG BEREUTER, for their hard work on this Commission. They have made some promising steps and I encourage the Senate to retain this worthwhile addition. But it's only one step in a multi-step process.

There is also no guarantee that the Chinese will cooperate with the commission. A commission will also not raise the issue in the public mind as much as the annual review process.

Even the surge protections are a welcomed addition to the legislation, but its benefit is exaggerated.

We have protections now, but under the agreement, if we use them, China can retaliate against us. Also, what guarantee do we have that the Chinese will accept our definition of a surge in imports and respect our decision? The real answer is maintaining the annual review process.

The annual review process focuses attention on China's practices in a way that is unmatched with any other country. It brings awareness to China's practices on human rights and other issues to the highest levels. Because of China's record on human rights, the environment and compliance with international treaties, the American people should be making this decision every year.

The administration's plan to set up a new rapid response team to monitor China's compliance with its market commitments under WTO reinforces the argument I've been making all along—China won't comply with the new agreement.

Like some of my colleagues, I believe China must meet a set of benchmarks before we make these benefits permanent.

First, they must recognize basic human and worker rights. Second, they must stop the proliferation of missile and nuclear technology and equipment. Third, they must promote environmental conservation. And fourth, they must comply with past and present international commitments.

When China has proven itself politically and economically mature enough for PNTR, only then should we extend these benefits. Until then, we should oppose this agreement, vote down this legislation and maintain the annual review process.

It is dangerous to give up the most important leverage we have in getting China to comply with its agreements, the annual review process and the carrot of permanent relations. You don't give away the carrot before you get the result you want.

---

COMMENDING LIFE UNIVERSITY AND ITS 17TH ANNUAL RUN FOR LIFE

**HON. BOB BARR**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 25, 2000*

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to congratulate the founder and