No matter how thankful we may be for our freedoms, we must not be lulled into complacency about the situation faced by so many Christians and others persecuted for their religious practices and convictions. As a nation that has become powerful in large part because we jealously guard our individual freedoms, we have a responsibility to project the ideals of freedom around the globe. The responsibility belongs to individuals and advocacy groups, to businesses and to churches, but it also belongs to this our Government.

While we have taken steps to recognize all religious persecution as a serious problem and to monitor its prevalence, we need to take the next step and develop clear-cut, specific responses to persecution once it is identified. The solution may not be readily apparent but the crisis demands our full attention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SANFORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the eve of the debate on fast track that is the giving of a major part of our constitutional power to the President and the Vice President and his negotiating team to negotiate trade arrangements with other nations, I think it is important for us to look at what the Founding Fathers said about the unfettered use of so-called free trade. In short, Mr. Speaker, they were not for it.

I want to start with James Madison. James Madison said it should never be forgotten that the great object of the Convention was to provide by a new Constitution a remedy for the defects of the existing one and that among these defects was out of a power to regulate foreign commerce, that in all nations this regulating power embraced the protection of domestic manufacturers by duties and restrictions on imports. That means that James Madison believed that it was important for a nation, particularly the United States, to have the right to regulate goods coming into the United States and to establish tariffs so that American companies and American workers would not be hurt. Thomas Jefferson, who was a free trader before 1812, after he became a President became a pragmatist, and he said, ''The prohibiting duties we lay on all articles of foreign manufacture which prudence requires us to establish at home, with a patriotic determination to use no foreign articles which can be made within ourselves without regard to difference in price, secure us against a relapse into foreign dependency.''

Thomas Jefferson realized that we could become dependent on foreign products. And what would he say today to look at this $3 billion balance of trade deficit that we have each week that we have to either borrow or sell capital goods to pay for, this massive foreign debt that we have accumulated as a function of our trade deficit?

Daniel Webster said, ''My object is and has been with the protective policy, the true policy of the United States that the labor of the country is properly provided for. I am looking not for such a law as will benefit capitalists, they can take care of themselves, but for a law that will induce capitalists to invest their capital in such a way as to occupy and employ American labor.'' That meant that Daniel Webster wanted to have tariffs and regulate trade so that American companies would invest in the United States instead of moving to Guadalajara or moving to other places that are offshore and using other workers from other countries to make goods that then would be sold back into the United States.

And our own Abraham Lincoln, the founder of my party, the Republican Party, said in the platform, ''We commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the working man liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence.''

And that other great Republican who, with Abraham Lincoln, is on Mount Rushmore, Teddy Roosevelt, said in 1911, ''I can put my position on the tariff in a nutshell. I believe in such measure of protection as will equalize the cost of production here and abroad, that is, will equalize the cost of labor here and abroad. I believe in such supervision of the workings of the law as to make it certain that protection is given to the man we are most anxious to protect, the laboring man.''

Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican, I am a capitalist, I think I have got a 13 percent AFL–CIO rating, but I understand that it is important for Americans to make good wages. We have driven wages down, and the record of NAFTA, the trade agreement that we allowed President Clinton to make with Mexico and Canada, has been disastrous for us. We had a $3 billion trade surplus over Mexico when we negotiated NAFTA. Today we have got a $19 billion annual loss. Today we have a $20 billion annual loss with Canada. That same bright team that President Clinton has sent forth through the world to negotiate trade treaties has given us this year with China a $52 billion trade loss.

This team is a losing team, Mr. Speaker, and the idea that this Congress is going to give away the constitutional duty that was given to us by the Founding Fathers to a losing team which will negotiate us down the drain to the point where we have American industry having to move offshore to compete with the other industries that are employing people at $2.38 an hour, $1.50 an hour, $1.75 an hour to displace Americans, the Americans who carry our flag in wartime, the Americans that pay our taxes, the Americans that pay our wages, that idea is not consistent with the classic idea of being a good Republican.

We should defeat this fast track, Mr. Speaker. We should keep that duty, that obligation to regulate trade within this House of Representatives where as Alexander Hamilton said, the people govern.

FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time tonight initially talking about the fast track legislation which we are likely to be voting on either tomorrow or Sunday. I am very much opposed to the fast track legislation for a number of reasons, and I wanted to use part of the hour tonight to outline some of those reasons and begin with a local situation in Monmouth County, which is one of the two counties that I represent in the State of New Jersey, because I think it illustrates the types of problems that I have with fast track by reference to NAFTA. Many of those who are opposed to fast track and who will be voting against fast track legislation, if it comes up over this weekend, are doing so because of the experience with NAFTA.

I want to comment on why Congress really should resist the pressure being put on us to grant the fast track authority, to expand NAFTA and essentially put even more Americans out of work. If I could give an example from central New Jersey, from Monmouth County, my home county, of how these trade agreements can affect the jobs and the lives of highly skilled American workers. On September 9, most of the 240 people who work at the Allied Signal plant in Eatontown, NJ, in Monmouth County were informed of the decision to close what is a defense technology manufacturing plant. They were told that the plant would be phased out in 1998, with a complete shutdown expected by March 1999. The company told the Allied Signal workers in Monmouth County, NJ, that in the short run, the jobs would be going to Tucson, AZ. But I believe, and I know that everyone at the plant believes, that the jobs ultimately will be moved to Mexico. The reason is squarely because of NAFTA.

Allied Signal is one of the many companies with a history of relocating production facilities to Mexico. NAFTA has greatly facilitated the flight of manufacturing jobs south where corporations can take advantages of low wages, substandard labor rights, and weak environmental protection and enforcement. The recent experience with Allied Signal shows everything that is wrong in corporate America today; namely, corporations abruptly turning their backs on the workers and the communities that have made them profitable.

Ironically, the hard-working folks at Allied Signal are involved in the kind of high tech work needed to protect our national security, for the United States to maintain its technological edge over our adversaries and for the protection of our Nation and our allies. Yet the security of the very same defense workers who have helped to make America the world's superpower are now being abandoned in the search for higher profits and lower wages. The workers of Allied Signal and many other such plants have lived up to their end of the bargain but their employers have not.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just talk about this plant a little bit. The plant is productive. Its employees are productive. It has won commendations from other major firms with which it has contracted, such as McDonnell Douglas. The employees of Allied Signal deserve much of the credit for this fine track record and they deserve a much better fate than this betrayal by the company to which they have devoted so much of their time, energy and talent and dedication. The union representing the employees of Allied Signal, Local 417 of the IUE, the Electronics Workers Union, has organized a petition drive and is enlisting the help of their affiliates, and they are also organizing demonstrations, they have over the past couple of months, to publicize the movement of their work to Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, the move of this facility is an example, in my opinion, of the negative effects fast track agreements like NAFTA are having on America's working men and women, an example that hits very close to home for me. The loss of quality manufacturing jobs is felt not only by the workers and their immediate families, their buying power is diminished, meaning that the store, the small businesses, the small business owners throughout the area also feel the pinch. Fast track deals do not include standards to protect workers and consumers. They do not give those of us in Congress who were elected by our constituents back home to do a job to look out for their interest, to fix what is wrong. Since NAFTA was passed, more than 420,000 American workers have lost their jobs. That trend continues and will only get worse if we do not stop these unfair trade deals.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly salute the men and women of the IEUE in central New Jersey for refusing to accept the loss of these Allied Signal jobs without a fight, and, although they have an uphill fight, their effort to mobilize solidarity among union ranks and to educate the wider public about the negative effects of these trade deals will go a long way to derailing fast track and putting our trade policy on the right track.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is highly unlikely that the fast track legislation will pass. I hope it will not. I will do whatever I can to stop it. But I want to say that one of the reasons why the opponents of fast track are likely to succeed and should succeed is because of the fact that there have been so many examples around the country like Allied Signal and Eatontown, and many of the workers have joined together and said, look, we have had enough, we cannot have this type of thing continue with the expansion of fast track authority.

And, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use Allied Signal as an example, but I also wanted to talk in general about fast track and the environment, because one of the major reasons that I oppose the fast track relates not only to labor concerns and worker concerns here in the United States, but also to environmental concerns.

We were, those of us, and I was not, those of us who were asked by the administration to support NAFTA a few years ago, were told that if they did, there would be adequate addressing in NAFTA of their concerns on the environment, and there would be adequate enforcement if environmental problems arose. But the reality is with NAFTA that none of that happened. There has not been any environmental enforcement, there has not been any real impact to try to protect the environment.

And if I can just give an example, most of the commitments that were made by the administration then were put into what is called an environmental side agreement, a side agreement to NAFTA that was supposedly going to protect the environment. What we found out since NAFTA began is that these side agreements are, in effect, unenforceable, and so any suggestion pursuant to the fast track legislation that is likely to come this week that somehow there will be environmental provisions contained therein or their side agreements will be enforcemental on protective environmental concerns, there is no reason to believe that, because it did not happen with NAFTA.

More than 3 years ago, the Commission on Environmental Compliance, the CEC, was established under NAFTA for environmental cooperation. This was the North American Agreement for Environmental Cooperation, the environmental side agreement to NAFTA. The CEC could be considered to be the sort of EPA equivalent under NAFTA. Yet of the 10 enforcement cases submitted to the CEC, the Commission on Environmental Compliance, under NAFTA, only one has resulted in an investigation.

Enforcement cases submitted to the CEC have included wetland pollution in Alberta, Canada; water pollution from livestock farming in Quebec; untreated sewage discharges into the Magdalena River in Sonora, Mexico; a massive bird die-off in the Silver Reservoir in Mexico; and dynamiting of a coral reef, imagine that, in a protected natural reserve in Cozumel, Mexico, for the construction of a cruise ship pier.

Now, although it was submitted almost 2 years ago, a final decision on this last case, the Cozumel pier case, the one case which the CEC has agreed to investigate, is being delayed pending a vote by the CEC members. Of the remaining nine cases, four have been rejected, one has been withdrawn, two have been objected to by the Canadian Government, and two are still pending review.

So this is all nonsense. There is not going to be any enforcement. Anybody who has brought to the attention of the CEC, this Commission that was set up under NAFTA for environmental concerns, anybody who brought any concerns to them has basically been told go away, or somehow has been swept under the rug.

In fact the Wall Street Journal recently wrote, and I quote, that both supporters and opponents of NAFTA agree that the side agreements, not only the environmental side agreements, but all the side agreements, the labor side agreement, have had little impact, mainly because the mechanisms that created them have almost no enforcement power. Our experience with NAFTA has proven that environmental side agreements are not enforceable, and that is why environmental groups, even groups that support NAFTA, are solidly united in opposition to fast track.

Last time there were a number of environmental groups who supported NAFTA. This time they are all unanimously opposed to fast track because they realize that these environmental side agreements have been completely ineffective.

Let me talk a little bit more about what the President and the Vice President have told us in terms of, in trying to address the concerns that people like myself and others who have concerns about the environment, in trying to address our concerns in the context of fast track. The President and the Vice President have stated that the negotiating objectives outlined in the administration's fast track legislation would include specific references to the environment.

Let me say that all that is simply window dressing. None of that means a thing.

It is not enough to simply make the environment a negotiating objective. In order for fast track to truly address

environmental concerns, it would have to clearly set environmental protection guidelines for all parties involved. It would be critical that fast track require that environmental concerns be directly addressed in negotiated trade agreements rather than allowing environmental protection to be negotiated separately in these unenforceable side agreements, the experience of which we had in NAFTA. They cannot possibly adequately protect the health and safety of American families.

And agreements negotiated under fast track should also be required to include enforcement mechanisms that will serve to hold governments to set environmental protection standards. None of this is being proposed with the fast track legislation that we are going to see possibly this weekend.

Again the inadequacy of the environmental side agreement to NAFTA and its protection of the United States-Mexican border environment serves as a disturbing example of the ineffectiveness of the environmental side agreements that the administration has proposed. The number of factories along the already heavily polluted United States-Mexico border has increased by 20 percent since NAFTA went into place, yet little is being done to insure that these new facilities are complying with environmental standards. The health and safety of American families are being put at risk by the 44 tons of hazardous waste that are illegally dumped by these border facilities every day.

Free trade agreements, I should say, also create pressure on neighboring governments to relax environmental regulations in an effort to lure manufacturers across borders, thereby allowing these companies to profit by polluting and abusing natural resources. We had this underlying problem that, in effect, what NAFTA has done and, in effect, what the free trade agreements will do if there is not adequate protection, which this legislation does not do, is that they basically create a ratcheting down so that environmental laws, environmental protection became less and less because of the competition between the countries and between the companies, each country, in effect, trying to provide less and less environmental protection in order to lure jobs and companies.

Rather than entering into trade agreements that directly undermine U.S. efforts on the environment, these agreements should establish a level playing field among neighboring countries that requires all parties involved to adequately protect the environment, natural resources and human health, but this is not happening, Mr. Speaker. This is not happening with the fast track legislation that we may see tomorrow or Sunday or perhaps at some later time.

It is not just the environment. Another major issue that has come to the forefront, an area that is not being adequately addressed, is that of food. There are tremendous food safety problems that have resulted from the NAFTA experience.

Many of my colleagues have highlighted; I wanted to mention Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut, one of my colleagues who put out a dear colleague just a couple of days ago which she calls fast track stomachache, and she points out that each year overburdened American Customs inspectors allow more than 3 million trucks carrying produce from Mexico to cross the United States-Mexico border without inspection. Less than 1 percent of all trucks crossing the border are stopped and thoroughly inspected. Canadian beef is not properly inspected at the United States border for dangerous chemicals. More than 200 cases of the potentially fatal hepatitis-A have been associated with strawberries imported from Mexico. But NAFTA's regulations have denied us the chance to change the situation.

Under section 7171(a), the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] writes, an increase in inspections of meat, produce and other perishables are considered a restraint on trade. So the continued absence of inspections only encourages importers to continue to cut corners, jeopardizing our food safety to guarantee larger profits for themselves.

Again, whether it is the environment, human health, food safety, labor laws, none of these, none of these are being protected, none of these are being addressed under NAFTA, and there is absolutely no reason to believe that they will be addressed under the fast track agreement that we are being asked to consider either tomorrow or Sunday.

Now, I wanted to get into some of the labor issues as well because in the same way that I am concerned about the impact of fast track on the environment and food safety, I am also concerned about the impact on labor, on wages, on people's ability to retain their jobs, going back to Allied Signal and the example I used again from my home county of Monmouth County, NJ.

Public Citizen, which is a watchdog group, put out a publication just a few days ago where they point out how the labor side agreements, or the labor side agreement under NAFTA, that those have also not been enforceable and have not managed to protect a single worker essentially under NAFTA, and there is no reason to believe that the experience would be any different with fast track.

I wanted to just use a couple examples from the document called Deals for NAFTA, Votes to Bait and Switch, which Public Citizen put out this month. There are many examples of broken promises in this document, but just to give a few examples here this evening:

One of the promises that were made with those who were concerned about displaced workers pursuant to NAFTA related to assistance for harmed workers. In other words, the idea is if you lost your job because of NAFTA, you were going to be made whole in some fashion. There is absolutely, the whole history of this effort called trade adjustment assistance for harmed workers has been one of failure.

Just to give an example, this program was created, as I said, to hold harmless workers, and it is estimated that more than 400,000 Americans have been laid off due to NAFTA. The NAFTA-implementing legislation created the Transitional Adjustment Assistance Program. To date only one-third of NAFTA job loss victims are being certified as potential recipients of benefits under this program, and as of mid-October 1997, 144,691 workers have been certified as eligible for assistance. So of the 400,000 that we estimate have lost their jobs under NAFTA, only 144,000 have been certified to even receive assistance.

Now, that does not mean that they are even going to get any assistance. Essentially you have to show that you are directly impacted in some way to qualify, and the reality is that many of these workers have had a very difficult time getting any kind of benefits under these workers training programs, under this hold harmless program.

The other thing that was promised pursuant to NAFTA again by the administration was an effort to protect and promote labor rights in Mexico. In other words, some of us were concerned about protecting workers here; others were concerned about what would happen to workers in Mexico. President Clinton promised to use existing trade laws to take action if Mexico's policies denied internationally recognized workers' rights, but not only did the administration not fulfill its promise in this regard, which required issuance of an executive order, but it has since taken steps in its fast track proposal to ensure that neither President Clinton nor any future President has the authority to do so.

So what we have been seeing in Mexico is that not only are labor laws not respected or not enforced, but, in fact, what has been happening is that the actual, the protections and the wages for Mexican workers have actually gotten less, and the amount of money that they are making, the minimum wage, has not only not risen, it has moved in the opposite direction. Between 1993 and the first quarter of 1997, productivity in Mexico manufacturing rose by over 38 percent while real hourly wages for production workers fell 21 percent.

□ 2045

The national average minimum wage fell by 20.43 percent during the first 4 years and 9 months of NAFTA.

So the labor side agreement, the environmental side agreement, it has really been effectively worthless. There is absolutely no reason to believe that anything would be any different with the fast-track legislation that we are considering.

If I could just summarize in a way some of the concerns, it is not that those of us who are opposed to fast track are opposed to free trade. I do not see it as a vote on free trade at all. What we are concerned with, though, is we do not want to negotiate away in one fell swoop, if you will, any ability on our part, on Congress' part, if you will, to protect the American workers, to protect the environment.

We want to reserve the right, if you will, to look at the agreements that would be negotiated individually and to make sure that there are adequate protections of the environment, adequate labor protections, adequate food safety protections, in those agreements.

The problem is that if you simply pass fast track, in effect you are giving the administration a blank check to extend NAFTA without Congress having the opportunity to seriously address the problems that have been raised with NAFTA.

If we look at our trade deficit, if we look at what is happening, the United States trade deficit with Mexico has skyrocketed. In the auto sector alone the deficit has jumped from $3 billion to $15 billion. A number of jobs have already been lost because of NAFTA. Drug trafficking, violent crime in our border regions has increased, and I already talked about the public health, of course.

So what those of us who are opposed to fast track are saying is the experience with NAFTA tells us we cannot simply give the administration the blank check that they are looking for with fast track. We have to have input into the trade agreements that are being negotiated, and, if we do not, we believe that there will be more tragic consequences that result in the same way that the tragic consequences have resulted from what has happened with NAFTA and the experience of NAFTA over the last few years.

TURKISH STUDIES CHAIR AT UCLA

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just talk briefly about a few other issues. First of all, I should say that my colleague from California [Mr. SHERMAN], touched on two issues that I wanted to mention briefly also this evening. He mentioned that the University of California at Los Angeles, UCLA, is establishing a Turkish Studies Chair, funded I may add, by the Government of Turkey. I wanted to join the gentleman in expressing my serious concern about this unfortunate use of a major prestigious university as a vehicle of indoctrination by another country.

In my home State of New Jersey, we had a similar situation where Princeton University set up a study program that was financed by the Government of Turkey. As a result, the information that was coming out of the study program essentially denied the Armenian genocide. There has been a history with the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey to basically deny that the Armenian genocide ever occurred.

My concern, and I know that of Mr. SHERMAN as well, is that by establishing these chairs or these Turkish study programs in different parts of the country, in my case at Princeton, in his case at UCLA, the Turkish Government is using these study programs to basically deny history and deny the facts of the Armenian genocide. In fact, it is really a brazen opportunity, if you will, a brazen attempt by a foreign government, to manipulate an American university for the denial of the historically verified genocide of the Armenian Nation.

The Turkish Government is not setting up scholarships. These are propaganda and propaganda alone. It would be like a German Government that had not acknowledged the Holocaust funding a Nazi studies program at an American university. Of course, the difference is that Germany at least accepts responsibility and apologizes for the Holocaust of the Jewish people. The Turkish Government, still defying the historical record, denies that the Armenian genocide ever happened.

I just wanted to join this evening with the Armenian community in the United States in appealing to the officials at UCLA, in the same way that I did at Princeton University about a year ago, and ask the board of regents to stop the effort of filling the heads of young Americans with revisionist propaganda in the name of so-called scholarship.

This is something that we have seen happen more and more where the Turkish Government has been financing these study programs or chairs at various American universities in order to basically deny the Armenian genocide.

PLIGHT OF THE KURDISH PEOPLE

I know Mr. SHERMAN also mentioned earlier this evening, and another of my colleague from California, BOB FILNER, has basically spearheaded this effort, there has been a group of Kurdish Americans who have been fasting on the steps of the Capitol, on the main steps of the Capitol now for a number of days, probably more than a few weeks, in order to highlight, if you will, the ongoing tragedy in the mountains of Kurdistan, where, again, the Turkish Government, which is, of course denying the Armenian genocide and continues to, is also basically trying to essentially obliterate, not only individually by killing Kurds in Turkey, but also by denying Kurds the ability to speak their language, to learn about their culture, to go to school in Kurdish, and this fast, conducted by supporters of the Turkish people on the Capitol steps, includes the human right activist Cameron Porter, who is the spouse of one of our colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHN PORTER].

I just want to say these fasters deserve tremendous credit for the dedication, courage and perseverance. It has been getting cold lately here in Washington, but that has not deterred them.

Last Friday I joined with a group of my colleagues, members from both sides of the aisle, to visit with the fasters and supporters. I know Congressman SHERMAN and Congressman FILNER were out there with me. Every day as we pass by these people sacrificing for the causes of peace and human rights, the sight of these protestors on the Capitol steps is a reminder to all people of conscious of the plight of the Kurds and the governments that hold them down, most notably the Government of the Republic of Turkey.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, as we come into the Capitol to cast votes on legislation, sent here to do a job by the constituents who elected us, I hope we will remember one of our fellow elected legislators who does not have the opportunity to represent her constituents, Mrs. Leyla Zana, one of the most prominent victims of Turkey's cruel, irrational anti-Kurd cruel policies.

Leyla Zana was elected to a seat in the Turkish Parliament in 1991 representing her hometown. She was elected with 80 percent of the total vote, and she became the first Kurd to break the ban on the Kurdish language in the Turkish Parliament, for which she was later tried and convicted. She had uttered the following words: ''I am taking this Constitutional oath for the brotherhood of the Turkish and Kurdish peoples.''

On May 17, 1993, she and one of her colleagues addressed the Helsinki Commission of the U.S. Congress. The testimony was used against her in a court of law. On March 2, 1994, her constitutional immunity as a member of Parliament was revoked and she was arrested, taken into custody, tried in a one-sided mockery of justice, convicted, and sentenced to 15 years in prison.

Leyla Zana, who is 35 years old and the mother of two children, is well into the third year of her 15 year sentence at a prison in Ankara, the Turkish capital.

Leyla Zana's pursuit of Democratic change by nonviolent means was honored by the European Parliament, which unanimously awarded her the 1995 Sakharov Peace Prize. She has received major consideration for the Nobel Peace Prize. More than 150 Members of this House, my colleagues, have written to President Clinton on her behalf, and I hope a majority of the Members of this House will join with the European Parliament in defending the human and civil rights of this brave woman, and I might remind my colleagues, a fellow Parliamentarian, a fellow elected official. We owe her our moral support and to urge our ambassador in Ankara to raise Mrs. Zana's case with the Turkish authorities at the highest levels.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to share with the Members of this body and anyone watching this some of the basic goals of Ms. Lasagna, of the fasters outside this building, and of the repressed Kurdish people of Turkey. The Kurdish identity must be recognized. The use of the Kurdish language in

conversation and in writing should be legalized. All cultural rights should be conceded. Kurdish political parties must be given full constitutional rights and a general amnesty for all political prisoners must be granted.

Mr. Speaker, we often hear from our own administration and other apologists for Turkey about what a great democracy the Republic of Turkey is. Yet this is how a duly elected representative of that so-called democracy is being treated for the crime of speaking her language and defending the rights of her people.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot go on. For many years we have witnessed a clear pro-Turkish tilt on the part of the State Department. We often hear about strategic importance of Turkey and its pivotal location, and I do not discount those arguments completely. But we have to balance those factors against some other very important considerations.

Turkey continues to spend billions of dollars in obtaining sophisticated weapons systems, not only from the United States, but from France, Russia and elsewhere. Much of this military hardware is then used to repress and terrorize the Kurdish people, citizens of Turkey who should be extended the protection of their country's armed forces and not be victimized by those armed forces.

Meanwhile, Turkey does not have a strong industrial base, and is lacking in infrastructure in many key areas. So why is Turkey, our ally, throwing so much of its limited resources on sophisticated weapons to use against its Kurdish residents, when it could be investing in better schools, health care and other services that could help put Turkey on a par with the western nations it seeks to be associated with?

About half of the worldwide Kurdish community lives within the borders of the Republic of Turkey, where their treatment is an absolute affront to basic fundamentals of human rights.

At least one-quarter of the population of Turkey is Kurdish. Yet in Turkey, the Kurds are subjected to a policy of forced assimilation which is essentially written into the Turkish Constitution. To date, 3,134 Kurdish villages have been destroyed and more than 3 million of their residents have been forced to become refugees, either in Kurdistan or abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that in many ways what we are seeing happen in Kurdistan today is in some ways the prelude to the same type of genocide that occurred by the Turks against the Armenian people 80-some years ago.

While the situation for the Kurdish people in such nations as Iraq, Iran and Syria is also deplorable, I wish to draw particular attention to the situation in Turkey for some basic reasons. Turkey is, after all, a military ally of the United States, a member of NATO. As such, it has received billions of dollars in military and economic assistance, courtesy of the American taxpayers. In addition, Turkey aspires to participate in other major western organizations and institutions, such as the European Union.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most Americans would be frankly appalled to know a country that has received so much in the way of American largesse is guilty of so many breaches of international law and simple human decency. I have joined with many of my colleagues in denouncing Turkey's illegal blockade of Armenia, its failure to acknowledge responsibility for the Armenian genocide of 1915 through 1923, its ongoing illegal occupation of Cyprus and its threatening military maneuvers in the Aegean Sea.

The brutal treatment of the more than 15 million Kurds living within Turkish borders offers a major argument for cutting back on military and economic aid to Turkey, or to at least attach very stringent conditions to provisions of this aid.

If Turkey wants the benefits of inclusion in Western institutions that are supposed to be founded on the defense of democracy and human rights, then that country should start living up to the agreements it has signed.

Again, the situation in Kurdistan is just another example of the type of treatment that Turkey has done historically with the Armenian people and other peoples, and it must stop.

TRIBUTE TO RAVI SHANKAR

Mr. Speaker, I would like to do one more thing tonight, if I could. This is because of a couple of events that are going to occur this weekend, both at the Embassy of India and also at the Kennedy Center with regard to the legendary sitar virtuoso and composer, Ravi Shankar. I just wanted to make a tribute to Ravi Shankar this evening before the House.

On this Sunday, November 9, at the Kennedy Center Concert Hall, Ravi Shankar, the legendary sitar virtuoso and composer, will perform in concert with his daughter. Ravi Shankar is India's most esteemed musical ambassador and a singular phenomenon in the classical music worlds of both East and West.

His pioneering work in bringing Indian music to the West has helped to cultivate an unprecedented audience, making him an important and respected cultural influence for over 40 years. As a performer, composer, teacher, and writer, he has obtained a level of admiration and respect, both in India and in the West, that is unique in the annals of the history of music.

Mr. Speaker, two quotes from musicians representing widely different points on the musical spectrum, both of whom have been friends and collaborators with Ravi Shankar, show the profound reach of his enigmatic genius.

The great classical violinist Yehudi Menuhin said, ''Ravi Shankar has brought me a precious gift and through him I have added a new dimension to my experience of music.'' To me, his genius and humanity can only be compared to that of Mozart.'' George Harrison, the former Beatle, said, ''Ravi Shankar is the Godfather of World Music.''

□ 2100

To honor his 75th birthday, a four CD boxed set, entitled ''Ravi in Celebration'' has been issued. And Ravi Shankar has not stopped creating spiritually powerful new music. His latest CD, ''Chants of India,'' produced by George Harrison, offers a new approach to the traditional and Vedic and Upanishad hymns.

Pandit Ravi Shankar has been honored throughout the world, by the leaders in the realms of politics and the arts. In India, he has received the Nation's highest civilian awards. He was awarded an honorary doctorate from Harvard University. He has the distinction of being a Commandeur de l'Ordre des Lettres in France, he was presented with the Praemium Imperial Prize of the Japan Art Association by the Japanese Royal Family, among many other distinctions and honors. That list of awards will grow tomorrow, Saturday, November 8, when Ravi Shankar is honored by the U.S. Asia Foundation and the Indian American Forum for Political Education with the Light of Asia Award at a reception by India's Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable Naresh Chandra.

Mr. Speaker, the occasion of India's 50th anniversary of independence and democracy gives us an opportunity to reflect on the great contributions by Indians and people of Indian descent. For decades, in virtually every part of the world, Ravi Shankar's music has held audiences spellbound. Further, his artistic genius is matched with an abiding devotion to building bridges of friendship and understanding across the cultural and political gulfs that have divided people.

Maestro Shankar's concert on Sunday with his daughter Anoushka is being held in tribute to the 50th anniversary of India, a country to which he remains devoted. But, as is always the case when Ravi Shankar performs, Sunday evening's concert will transcend the boundaries of culture and language. Ravi Shankar is a great international artist with the power to move his audience with his unparalleled genius and vision. I am very pleased tonight to be able to take a couple of minutes to pay tribute to this man.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to request to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], and I guess then he could yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

POWERFUL ARGUMENTS AGAINST FAST TRACK

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like 5 minutes of that time, and I hope you will tell me when my time is up, because I would like to yield the balance to my other colleague.

I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for being so generous with his time. I want to compliment him, a very active member of the Democratic Party, and compliment the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], also a very active member of the Republican Party, for their very articulate remarks against giving President Clinton fast track authority to negotiate new free trade agreements with other countries.

Mr. Speaker, we have a constitutional crisis in our country. In addition to everything that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] said, which was on the mark, and everything that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] said that was on the mark of why this trade agreement is bad, it is bad because it violates the Constitution of the United States.

Apparently, there are a number of Congressmen who, after working very hard to get here, decided that they do not want to do their job. The first time that Congress gave away their constitutional responsibility was on the War Powers Act. If we look at Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, it very clearly gives to Congress and Congress alone the power to declare war. Our Founding Fathers did that because they grew up in an era where one king or one queen could decide for everyone that the Nation's youth would go off and die, and they wanted to change that. So they saw to it that the people's representatives and only the people's representatives by a majority vote could make that decision.

When Congress gave the President the War Powers Act, it was the first time they gave away their constitutionally mandated responsibilities.

The second time they did that was just last year when the majority in Congress voted to pass the line-item veto. It was espoused at the time as something to cut the pork out of the budget, but they failed to mention that it was a budget that Congress put together. It was in effect saying that we cannot help ourselves.

I voted against that, and I predicted at the time that all that it would be used to do is cut the defense budget. Thus far, Mr. Speaker, I am 90 percent right, because 90 percent of all of the things that have been vetoed by the President of the United States are defense related, and none of them contained any pork.

Either tomorrow or Sunday, this body will once again have to make a decision as to whether or not we want to keep our constitutionally mandated duties or give them to the President of the United States. I am going to vote to keep those duties that I want the citizens of south Mississippi to have, and I think that more than half of my Democratic colleagues, for a variety of reasons, will vote to do so. So I really want to address my talk tonight to my Republican colleagues and those people who consider themselves to be Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, almost on an hourly basis my Republican colleagues come to the House floor and say that President Clinton cannot be trusted. And they point to some things that would certainly give a great deal of credibility to their arguments. I hope that they are saying what they mean, and that they will mean what they say, because they will be asked either tomorrow or Sunday to give away their constitutionally mandated responsibility as espoused in Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution to regulate commerce. They will be giving that, if they vote for fast track, to the man they say cannot be trusted. It is a very powerful argument for every Republican in this Congress to vote against fast track.

Mr. PALLONE is right when he talks about people being hurt. I represent 1/435th of this country. In that 1/435th of this country, 5 factories have been closed. The people who want to give the President fast track authority tout it as being somehow a way to smack the unions about. Not one of those factories was a union factory, not one. What it was was a place that in most instances employed women who had found themselves, either through the death of their husband or the separation from their husband as the sole earners of their family, they had been stuck with the responsibility of raising children and they were the only ones who were making a living. Ninety percent of the people who lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA were the women in those factories, not the union, ''union thugs,'' that were told were opposed to it.

It is even worse than that, because the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] comes from a very populous State, and maybe in a populous State like New Jersey the retraining that he talks about makes some sense, because maybe there is something else for those people to do. But I can assure my colleagues in Neely, Mississippi, in Wiggins, Mississippi, in Lumberton, Mississippi, and the other small towns of Mississippi that have had their only factory shut down as a result of NAFTA, there is nothing else for those people to do. It is simply not fair, and it is simply naive for Congress to imagine that there is additional opportunities for these people.

The only thing that Congress should know is that in a microcosm, the good people of America have been hurt and in a microcosm our Nation has gone from a trade surplus to a trade deficit with both Mexico and NAFTA as a result of the last Free Trade Agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, since we will have very, very little opportunity to speak on this in the next couple of days, and since apparently the Speaker of the House has seen to it that this vote will take place on a weekend when most congressional offices will be closed, and therefore, there will be no one at the phones to answer those phones when citizens want to call up and encourage their Congressman to vote against this, I want to take this opportunity to speak on it and have my remarks put in the RECORD.

AMERICA'S LOST VALUE: HARD WORK IS REWARDED

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition and I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey as well as the gentleman from Mississippi yielding time to me, and I would also start out by associating myself with the remarks made by both the gentleman from New Jersey as well as the gentleman from Mississippi on the proposed fast track authority that we in this Chamber will be voting on sometime Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a global economy and we are engaged in a global competition. I know this and so do the tens of thousands of working Americans that I represent. The people I represent in northwest Indiana are not afraid of competition. They embrace it, because they work hard and do their job better than anyone else in the world. The steel workers and other working men and women I represent are happy to trade their products in the world's markets, but in trading their products, they do not want to trade away a living wage.

For half a century, the people of America, at the cost of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, have fought and worked to export the unique American value of democracy. As we look back on history and at the world today, we can see we have achieved success in doing so. But as we stand here today, we must think about exporting another important American value, the value that hard work is rewarded. This is a value that I was taught growing up in Gary, Indiana. I was taught that if one studied in school and worked hard in life, one would be rewarded with a living wage that would allow you to get married, buy a house, have children, send them to school, and then enjoy an economically secure retirement.

But in today's debate on fast track, instead of working to export the American value of hard work globally, we are diminishing the value of work for all. The competition that will arise from the trade strategy we are debating today will not result in a race to the top, but in a drop to the bottom. And my fundamental concern is that if we in this House and others in this government do not export the value of labor and reward hard work in America, no one else will.

I find it interesting that prior to the adoption of NAFTA 3 years ago, a local industry told me that they supported the agreement because it would be good for us. Prior to NAFTA, the same industry had a trade surplus with Mexico. Since NAFTA, that industry has a trade deficit with Mexico 20 times as large. But they have never complained. Why? Because their bottom line has not changed, and in fact, it has increased. They invest overseas, paying

people less and make more money. Unfortunately, the thousands of employees they have left stranded in places like Gary, Indiana; New Chicago, Indiana, have no recourse. In abrogating their responsibility, the responsibility to fairly reward hard work, these corporate citizens of the United States of America have dashed the American dream of many of the people we represent.

We must not take the world economy as we find it and adapt to it, as so many people have suggested we do. We must make the world economy adapt to our fundamental American economic principle that hard work pays. It pays in the form of a living wage to working people.

It might not happen this year; it might not happen next year, it might not happen in 20 years, but if it happens 50 years from now, our grandchildren will look back and say that we today here in this place did not break our covenant with the next generation of American citizens.

I would ask all of my colleagues to join with me in opposing giving President Clinton his fast track authority.

□ 2115

THE BENEFITS FOR THE UNITED STATES OF SUPPORTING FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come here to this House, along with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, to talk about an issue that we believe is so critical to the future of this country; that is, trade.

In the end, though, trade is not really about statistics. It is not really about numbers. It is not, in a sense, even about jobs. It is about the opportunities for jobs. It is about the opportunities that American consumers have to make choices. It is about getting lower prices for goods and better quality, of having competition. Yes, it is about American leadership. It is about our place in the world. It is whether the United States is going to lead on trade or whether we are going to follow on trade.

The fact of the matter is there are very few countries in the world that benefit as much from trade as the United States of America does. I would just like to begin with this one chart, which shows how American businesses and American workers have benefited by the fact that U.S. exports have increased more than 3,000 percent in the last 35 years.

It is not that far back to 1961, when we look at the value of U.S. exports, they were less than $100 billion, around $50 billion. It did not reach $100 billion until about 1973. Then it has simply taken off since then. The most steep rise is in the last 2 years, the last 4 years, since 1993. Even as Americans continue to worry about trade deficits, we continue to have a very substantial growth in exports.

What does that mean? Does exports mean something to other than just a number on a chart, other than a line on a chart? It means a great deal. It means a lot about the growth. Growth, of course, means something about the jobs that are available to Americans.

This chart demonstrates the difference between jobs in the total civilian employment, which has been rising, this red line down here, which has been rising fairly steadily. But if we look at the export-related jobs as an index, this is on an index basis, we can see that the export-related jobs are growing much more rapidly.

In other words, the great economy that this country is enjoying today, the tremendous benefits that we all enjoy from having a low unemployment rate, from having the ability to have a second car, from rising incomes and wages, the vast majority of that has come from export-related jobs.

These are not jobs that are poor-paying jobs, they are better, much better, on average than the jobs that we have in the United States that are service economy jobs. Export manufacturing and service-related jobs pay, on average, about 16 percent more than a job that is totally or solely domestic-oriented.

So I would point out to my colleagues who have engaged in this debate about fast track, and whether or not the United States should continue to promote more jobs, that the bottom line really is that there really is not much choice. Our growth, our future, depends on creating these kinds of jobs so that our children and grandchildren will have jobs in the future. That is really what it is all about.

I know tonight we are going to want to talk a little bit, my colleague and I, a little bit about what fast track really means, and what it really means for America. But I think these charts right here demonstrate why trade is so important for America.

We, more than any other country in the world, have benefited from the tremendous increase that we have had in trade. Let me just show one more chart here that I think is very interesting, because we often hear that it is only the Boeings, it is only the Cargills, or Chryslers or General Motors that benefit from trade. But the fact is that small- and medium-size companies account for, in dollar volume, 30 percent of all of our exports. And if we look at it in terms of numbers of companies, 96 percent of the companies that are trading overseas are companies that have less than 500 employees.

So it is the small- and medium-sized businesses. Yes, they do not sell as much as Boeing. No, they do not sell as much as Ford, Chrysler, or IBM. But they, too, benefit from trade. Ninety-six percent of our companies with under 500 employees are the ones that are engaged in trade overseas. So it is not just the large companies, it is small companies as well, and it is in middle America, it is in the towns of Iowa and in the streets of Connecticut, and yes, in my State of Arizona, where people benefit because they have the ability to engage in trade overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON, an individual who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and has been instrumental in helping to carry this argument to the American people, and who I know has some thoughts about this.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman put the chart back up that shows just how much of America's economy depends on exports, that first one. The U.S. exports have increased 3,000 percent in the last 35 years. I do not think most of the people in America are conscious that 30 percent of our economic growth is the result of exports.

We saw in the gentleman's next chart how the number of jobs associated with exports is growing far more rapidly than the number of jobs associated with domestic sales. That is what fast track is all about. It is about whether or not we are going to be at the table to negotiate new markets for our exports.

I was thinking, as my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. GENE TAYLOR, spoke about the jobs lost in his district to international competition, about the jobs lost in my district to international competition, and nothing is more agonizing than to see a factory close or a business fail, because that is not just a business failure, that is people out of work.

But competitiveness has nothing to do with fast track. Those factories closing has nothing to do with fast track. In fact, if we do not negotiate access to new markets, if we cannot get American goods into new markets, far more factories will close because the issue is twofold.

The first issue is competitiveness; the second issue is open markets. We have to be competitive. You go down to your grocery store, you go down to your drugstore, you go down to the hardware, you go down to the department store. Any store in every American community has imports and domestically-made products.

America has to be able to sell the highest-quality, the lowest-cost product right here in their own hardware stores and department stores and grocery stores and pharmacies, and they also have to be able to sell the highest-quality, lowest-cost product in every other nation in the world in order for us to succeed.