Not when duty officers suffer chronic fatigue because staffing constraints permit only four hours of sleep at night; not when a commanding officer testifies before Congress that there’s not enough fuel to power his boats and planes.

And not when Coast Guard radio communications units are 30 years old, like the one described in a recent news account that began this way:

If you dial 911, say the word ‘fire’ and run outside, a fire engine will show up at your driveway. If you pick up the handset on your VHF-FM radio, say the work ‘Mayday’ and jump onboard, you could very well drown or die of hypothermia.

Study after study has documented these hazards. A recent Interagency Task Force concluded that “block obsolescence . . . presents a threat that [the Coast Guard] could soon be overwhelmed by a mismatch between its missions and the quantity and quality of the assets to carry them out.”

A 1997 General Accounting Office review was even more blunt. It projected $90 million annual reductions in operating expenses just to bridge the gap. GAO was alarmed by “the sheer size of the gap and the dwindling number of available efficiency-related options.”

Where I’m from, a marine distress call is an urgent plea for emergency law enforcement and rescue personnel. When oil spills jeopardize economic as well as environmental resources; when frozen rivers trap heating oil barges; when the well-being of both fish and fishermen are threatened; when offshore dangers strike, we know were to turn.

That’s why when the ink dried on the House DOT appropriation, there was reason for new and genuine hope. Like having Pedro Martinez in the starting rotation, it felt like this really could be the year.

The DOT bill approved recently for next year increases Coast Guard accounts by near by $600 million, a 15 percent boost. It also includes $125 million to help modernize aging airplanes, helicopters and motor lifeboats—and upgrade, rather than abandon, Coast Guard stations and the communities they serve.

Years from now, the 395 House colleagues who voted for the DOT bill can look back and take satisfaction from the knowledge that they helped saved a life, a coastal community, an international alliance—or maybe even a marine species or two.

But that old curse still hovers over the Coast Guard. Just this week, the Senate Subcommittee came in $200 million lower.

The timing could not be worse. The Senate action followed two rounds of Coast Guard cutbacks for the current fiscal year, reducing cutter days and flight hours by 10 percent.

Why? Because the Coast Guard responded to natural disasters, but the Congress failed to pass emergency supplemental funding. And because a variety of overdue personnel benefits, for everything from housing to health care, were mandated by the 2000 Defense Authorization—but with no money to pay for them.

There’s more. The good news is a new effort, through the pending Military Construction bill, to restore $800 million in supplemental funding. But since only a third of that is designated as “emergency expenses,” the base-line for future Coast Guard budgets, next year and beyond, would be seriously compromised. So I express gratitude for the progress made in the chamber this far. But also to raise a warning flag about the two challenges immediately ahead.

Specifically, I urge my colleagues to hold firm in conference on the House-approved allocation in the Transportation Appropriation bill and then to receive Senate conference regarding the $800 million in the MilCon measure.

That’s what it will take for the Coast Guard to do the job we have assigned it to do. To contain oil spills. To catch smugglers. And, most important of all, to save lives.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, we have recently voted to maintain normal trade relations with China, which I believe will provide economic opportunities for us and further advance reforms that will promote democratization and hopefully improve human rights in that region.

China recently negotiated to become a member of the World Trade Organization, a union of 135 nations who will require China to follow established trade rules. China has agreed to lower tariffs and duties on many products imported from foreign countries including the United States. These lowered tariffs will increase American exports, expand opportunities for our businesses, and create new jobs. If we had not granted permanent normal trade relations with China, we would have lost these economic benefits to other countries that would trade with China.

Increased trade with China will create new jobs and stimulate the economy in my district. Lowered tariffs will apply to California’s Central Valley agricultural products, such as almonds, oranges, grapes, and cotton. In a few years, China will reduce its tariff on almonds from 30 to 10 percent, on oranges from 40 to 12 percent, and on grapes from 40 to 13 percent. China will also import millions of additional tons of cotton at a low duty. These lowered tariffs and duties will lead to lower prices for Chinese citizens who will demand more products, necessitating increased production in the Valley. New agricultural jobs will support this increased production.

We are already reaping abundant benefits from trade with other countries. Since July of 1999, Kern County alone has shipped over 220,000 tons of cotton to Mexico. Production, transportation, and marketing of cotton for Mexico have generated numerous jobs in the Central Valley. Because China’s population is significantly greater than that in the other countries with whom we trade, the amount of products we will export there will also be significantly greater.

Not only will increased trade benefit our economy, but it will also help further the expansion of freedoms in China. In any nation, this process takes time. Our own nation’s history attests to this fact. The rights guaranteed in our Constitution have not always been granted to everyone. For example, slavery, with all its abuses, was practiced for 78 years after the ratification of the Constitution. Eighty-three years after the Constitution, the Fifteenth Amendment theoretically granted suffrage to all people, regardless of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude,” but these rights continued to be denied to people of color. Our country progressed over time to expand and guarantee equal protection of rights under the law.

Just as the expansion of freedoms has progressed over time throughout the history of the United States, so it will take time for China to extend more freedoms to its citizens. China is just starting the process we have been pursuing for over two centuries, and they are in a different situation than was the United States at its foundation. Chinese leaders do not regard the individual as, in the words of our Declaration of Independence, “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights.” Their government does not derive its "just Power from the Consent of the Governed." The Chinese have still to develop a real understanding of the value of the individual.

Communist Party control over the financial future of Chinese citizens is weakening. Millions of people are migrating away from state-owned enterprises to work in private businesses. At these businesses, they experience improved working conditions and higher wages. They are less dependent on the government, can make their own choices, and thereby have more personal control over their lives. As this movement into the private sector continues, more people will come to expect and demand the reforms necessary to guarantee individual rights.

Exposure to international trade rules will enable the Chinese to appreciate establishing rule of law within their country. Increased trade with all nations will acquaint Chinese citizens with innovation and new technology, and allow us to support the Chinese people if they choose to push for these reforms. For all of these reasons, I am pleased that the House has voted for permanent normal trade relations with China. The bill is now in the Senate, where I am hopeful it will pass so that the United States and China together can secure the benefits of a more open trade relationship.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to commend Matt Linwong, a freshman at Mt. Vernon Township High School in Mt. Vernon, IL, for his academic achievement.
He recently scored a perfect 800 in English on the SAT and a near perfect 750 in math.

As a result, Matt has been accepted to the Illinois Math and Science Academy in Aurora, IL, which is a school for 10th-12th grade Illinois students who excel in mathematics and science. I want to wish Matt the best as he begins this new chapter in his life. He is an amazing young student who I know will go far and do great things.

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001**

**SPEECH OF HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON OF CONNECTICUT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Wednesday, June 15, 2000**

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to move this bill forward but also to express my concerns about what I consider to be seriously inadequate funding levels for education, health, and job training.

Chairman JOHN PORTER did an admirable job constructing this bill considering the difficult allocation he was given in the budget resolution. I opposed that resolution because it inadequately funded so many agencies. But as in years past, the Senate has more generous subcommittee allocations and therefore will fund many programs at higher levels than the House. Furthermore, the President has consistently advocated higher education and tied to that level of funding was direct services and child and adult protective services, meals-on-wheels, elderly and disabled services and child and adult protective services to name a few. During the debate over welfare reform, Congress guaranteed the states that they would fund SSBG at $2.38 billion and that states could transfer 10% of their TANF dollars into SSBG to develop the support network needed to families in transition from dependence to independence. However, to pay for last year's transportation bill, SSBG's authorization was cut to $1.7 billion and the transfer was reduced to 4.25%. While the level is lower than that I advocate for in my legislation, H.R. 4481, the House actually funded SSGB at its new authorization level of $1.7 billion. The Senate however cuts the program by $1.1 billion to $600 million. A cut of this magnitude will be devastating to community organizations that serve some of our most needy constituents. I urge my colleagues to restore full funding to $2.38 billion and the transfer to 10%.

**EDUCATION**

The House proposal provides additional resources to many important education programs but its failure to increase the allocation for Title I should be of concern to all Members. Both the President and the Senate provided increases which would enable us to reach as many as 260,000 more children. Further, H.R. 4577 would fund the Teacher Empowerment Act, a block grant of the Eisenhower Professional Development program, Goals 2000 and the President's class-size reduction program, at $1.75 billion instead of the proposed $2 billion authorization level. If Republicans are going to advocate for block granting similar pots of money—where we support—we must adequately fund the whole. As we have seen with TANF, Congress must abide by our promises and fully fund these programs if the new flexibility granted is to matter to kids, teachers and tax payers. This cut of $300 million sets a very dangerous precedent for those who strongly support block grants and I hope my colleagues will reconsider this funding level.

However, there are many programs which received increased funding from the Committee. The bill increases the average Pell Grant to $3,500, its highest level in history. Republicans have increased the Pell Grant, which saw cuts when the Democrats controlled both the White House and the Congress, by $1,200, or 50% since assuming the majority in 1995. Further, while the bill doesn't provide the additional $2 billion in funding agreed to by the House for IDEA, it does increase funding by $500 million. If there is one program that comes up in every meeting I have had with teachers and administrators in my district, it is IDEA. The increase of $500 million is a step in the right direction. I also applaud the Head Start increase of $400 million or 7.5% and the TRIO program increase of an additional $115 million over FY00.

Given the challenge presented to the committee by the budget resolution, they did a commendable job on this bill. However, many of its funding levels are inadequate and must grow through the process or I will vote against sending this bill to the President. Again, I will support this proposal because I believe that in the end we will have a bill that reflects our priorities—education, health care, and job training.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001**

**SPEECH OF HON. RON LEWIS OF KENTUCKY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Wednesday, June 14, 2000**

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under