

Mr. President, let me turn to another provision in the current fast-track proposal.

It may surprise some to know that while specific issues closely related to the long-term success and sustainability of any trade agreement are excluded, the provisions which offset the costs of any trade agreement—provisions which have absolutely no connection to the trade agreement or the willingness of our partners to negotiate with us—those funding provisions are covered by fast-track procedures.

What does this mean, Mr. President?

It means that Congress cannot amend, it cannot even strike, provisions which are attached to implementing legislation to offset the costs of the trade agreement.

It means that the most unjustified funding mechanism attached to trade implementing legislation under fast track will remain unscathed.

Mr. President, let me stress these funding provisions are not part of the trade agreement itself.

Our trading partners do not get a say in how we offset the cost of a trade agreement.

One might ask, if our trading partners have no say in the offset provisions, why are those provisions included under fast-track procedures.

An excellent question, Mr. President.

Many of us will recall the GATT implementing measure which included some controversial funding provisions, including a change in the actuarial standards of the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corp. and what many viewed as a sweetheart deal for certain media giants that gave them preferential treatment with respect to FCC licenses.

Neither of those offsets had anything to do with the underlying trade agreement.

Both certainly deserved more scrutiny than they received under the constraints of fast-track procedures.

Whatever justification there may be for providing special procedures for trade agreements, procedures which supporters argue are necessary to attract our trading partners to the table, there is no such justification for shielding the funding provisions from thorough congressional scrutiny and review.

Mr. President, we are talking about possible tax increases here.

Though not required, as I understand it, among the offsets that comply with our budget rules are tax increases.

To put it gently, it is ironic that many who would amend our Constitution to require a supermajority vote before any taxes could be increased are now prepared to support a fast-track bill that sweeps away even the most modest review of possible tax increases.

Evidently, as long as it is done in the name of free trade, even the most outrageous inconsistency is permitted.

Mr. President, let me reiterate that many of us who support free and fair trade find nothing inconsistent with

that support and insisting that Congress be a full partner in approving agreements.

Indeed, as Senator BYRD has noted, support for fast-track procedures reveals a lack of confidence in the ability of our negotiators to craft a sound agreement, or a lack of confidence in the ability of Congress to weigh regional and sectoral interests against the national interest, or may simply be a desire by the administration to avoid the hard work necessary to convince Congress to support the agreements it negotiates.

Mr. President, I can think of no better insurance policy for a sound trade agreement than the prospect of a thorough Congressional review, complete with the ability to amend that agreement.

Not only would the threat of possible Congressional modification spur our negotiators to produce the best product possible, that potential for Congressional intervention could serve as an effective club in the hands of our negotiators when bargaining with our trading partners.

Mr. President, with hundreds of trade agreements negotiated and implemented without fast track, the refrain we hear again and again, that we need to enact fast track in order to negotiate trade agreements, is off key.

We do not need fast track to negotiate trade agreements.

As I have argued today, in several important ways, fast-track invites bad trade agreements.

It produces agreements that pick winners and losers instead of advancing all sectors of the economy together.

It produces agreements designed to respond to the short-term interests of multinational corporations instead of fostering long-term sustainable economic growth.

It produces agreements that encourage a race-to-the-bottom in critical areas of human rights, and worker and environmental protection, instead of improving those standards around the World.

It protects the completely unrelated funding provisions in trade implementing legislation, and as such invites enormous abuse.

Mr. President, fast track is bad for free trade.

We don't need it, and we shouldn't enact it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation, and in doing so, voting for free and fair trade.●

TRIBUTE TO DON NOEL

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President. As 1998 rolls around, so does another election. But this upcoming campaign season will be different from any other that I have ever known. For the first time since I entered public office in 1974, a certain dapper reporter with a flower in his lapel will not be there reporting the facts of the campaign and offering his assessments. Don O. Noel, Jr., who

is one of the most prominent and respected journalists in Connecticut history, has retired after working for 39 years as a political reporter in Hartford.

Don Noel's career as a journalist dates all the way back to 1958, the year that my father was elected to the first of two terms as a U.S. Senator. It is amazing for anyone to have such a long career in any field, particularly in an area as mentally, physically, and emotionally demanding as journalism.

Don Noel started out as a writer for the Hartford Times, where he worked for 17 years. For a change of pace, he ventured into television journalism and spent a decade at WFSB-TV Channel 3. He eventually returned to print journalism in 1984 when he became a political columnist for the Hartford Courant, where he stayed until his retirement.

Don Noel was an old-school reporter in the truest and best sense of the term. He was always courteous and respectful of the people he interviewed and wrote about. At the same time, he refused to skirt around difficult issues and never refrained from asking stinging questions or making pointed comments. He felt that part of his role as a journalist was to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable.

Don Noel was able to succeed for so long because he was a reporter of substance who cared about the truth and cared about his readers. He understood that his role as a journalist was to hold politicians accountable for their actions and to serve as a watchdog on behalf of the general public.

Don Noel did more than simply report the facts, he also interpreted them. As an editorial page writer, he was responsible for offering his opinions on the issues of the day. Not everyone agreed with his ideas, but everyone respected them because they were always thoughtful and well-developed. Most of Mr. Noel's criticisms were aimed at those who tended to be a bit more conservative, but to the end he remained an equal opportunity critic. It didn't matter if you were a Democrat, Republican, or Independent; if you were a public official and Don Noel thought that you were anything less than an upstanding public servant, it's safe to say that your name would be in the paper that week.

One of his colleagues at the Hartford Courant noted that Don Noel was an institution not because of the number of years he put into service, but how well he applied them. I strongly concur with these sentiments and believe that Don Noel was one of the finest people that I have had the pleasure of knowing during my career in politics.

While his retirement is truly a loss for the people of Connecticut, I am glad that he will finally have more time to do the things that he truly enjoys. He has said that he plans to spend a good deal of his new-found free time doing community service work in the neighborhoods of northwest Hartford, where

he has volunteered for more than a decade. He also hopes to travel with his wife and have an opportunity to try other kinds of writing in which he won't have a deadline hanging over his head. Whatever he chooses to do in his retirement, I wish him only the best, and I thank him for his many years of service to the people of Connecticut.●

TRIBUTE TO PIETRO PARRAVANO

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize Pietro Parravano, a remarkable individual who has distinguished himself not only as an outstanding commercial fisherman, but as an eloquent ambassador for the fishing industry, regionally, nationally, and abroad.

A graduate of Eastern Michigan University, Mr. Parravano was an instructor of physics before becoming an active commercial fisherman 15 years ago. Mr. Parravano sails his vessel, the F/V *Ann-B*, from the port of Half Moon Bay in northern California.

A leader in the community, Pietro Parravano has represented the fishing industry in a variety of capacities. He has served as president of the Half Moon Bay Fishermen's Marketing Association, president of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, and chair of the Institute for Fisheries Resources. He is also a member of both the Local Fisheries Impact Program and the California Seafood Council.

Mr. Parravano has often played an important role in shaping sustainable fishing policies. He was appointed by the Governor to the Bay-Delta Advisory Committee, has been elected commissioner to the San Mateo County Harbor Commission, and will soon serve as a United States delegate to the World Forum of Fish Harvesters and Fishworkers to be held in India.

Time and again, his colleagues, the community, and the Government have trusted Pietro Parravano to represent the interests of fisher men and women.

It is my pleasure to congratulate Pietro Parravano upon receiving the 1997 Highliner of the Year Award, the fishing industry's highest honor.

Mr. Parravano is a credit to the fishing industry and to the State of California. I applaud his record of outstanding and dedicated public service and extend to him my sincerest appreciation for his commitment to sustainable fishing and the betterment of the lives of fishing men and women.●

THE PROSTATE CANCER RESEARCH STAMP ACT

● Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator SNOWE in introducing the Prostate Cancer Research Stamp Act of 1997 and urge the support of my colleagues. S. 1389 is a companion bill to Representative SHERROD BROWN's bill, H.R. 2545, which has 41 cosponsors.

The Prostate Cancer Research Stamp Act would authorize a new first-class

stamp priced at up to 8 cents above a regular first-class stamp. Postal patrons who choose to purchase the prostate cancer stamp will be contributing to prostate cancer research at the National Cancer Institute. As important, a special prostate cancer stamp will help to raise awareness of this disease, promote screening, and save lives.

Prostate cancer, the most common form of cancer in American men, will take 41,000 lives this year, nearly approaching the breast cancer death toll of 44,300. One of every eight is at risk of getting prostate cancer. Unfortunately, as the number of prostate cancer cases rises dramatically, research funding lags far behind what is needed to fight this disease. Although prostate cancer accounts for nearly 25 percent of diagnosed non-skin cancer, only 3.7 percent of Federal cancer research dollars are devoted to fighting it.

Apart from the important contribution to prostate cancer research, the prostate cancer stamp will raise awareness of this disease and help to persuade men over age 40 to have annual prostate exams. Prostate cancer is detectable, and when found early is often fully treatable through several different methods, including surgical removal of the prostate and radiation treatment. Men must demand both a PSA blood test and a digital-rectal exam as part of their annual medical exam. At the recent Senate Aging Committee hearing on prostate cancer, I commented that we men are such crybabies that we go out of our way to avoid medical tests. The women at the hearing erupted in laughter, but the men were pretty quiet. The fact is that prostate cancer can only be treated early if it's detected early, and the long list of survivors all say that early detection made the difference.

The sooner we enact this bill and make a postage stamp available, the greater the number of men who will get tested; and more testing means more men will survive prostate cancer.●

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WETHERSFIELD TEEN THEATER COMPANY

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Wethersfield Teen Theater Company, which is about to celebrate its 10th anniversary. This company was founded in 1988 by 15-year-old Bill Fennelly who was frustrated by the lack of opportunities in the theater for young people in the Wethersfield area, and the name of the company that Bill created indicates what makes this group so unique and special—it is run by and for teenagers.

Whether it's the director, the choreographer, or a member of the lighting crew, every member of the company must be between the ages of 11 and 21. The company members have complete artistic control over their productions, and they are also responsible for raising money and doing publicity for each play. Not only has the

Wethersfield Teen Theater given hundreds of young people an opportunity to express themselves artistically and experience the feeling of performing live on the stage; but this company also gave many young people leadership opportunities that people their age don't traditionally enjoy. People who participate in the Wethersfield Teen Theater learn lessons about personal responsibility that they will carry with them throughout their lives.

When the theater company was founded there were many doubters. Not only were people skeptical that a group of teenagers would be able to put on a quality theatrical production, there were questions about their ability to raise the money to stage a production. The Wethersfield Teen Theater put on a spring review called "On Broadway," and they were able to raise the money to stage a production of "Joseph and the Technicolor Dreamcoat."

"Joseph" was major success, and in 1990, the teen theater gained the official sponsorship of the Wethersfield Recreation and Parks Department. While the sponsorship provides the company with free rehearsal and performance space, the theater company is not a budgeted program and the teens still must earn all the money required to produce each show.

Since its founding, the Wethersfield Teen Theater Company has put on a major summer and spring production every year. In addition, the company also sponsors children's workshops that are designed to get children interested in theater. They also perform at local community events, elementary schools, and hospitals.

For a decade, people have been enjoying the talent, enthusiasm, and creativity of the Wethersfield Teen Theater Company, and on January 3, 1998, the group will celebrate its 10th Anniversary with the performance of a production called "Our Time." I am certain that this production will be a great success, and I hope that this wonderful theater company will continue enriching the lives of young people in the Wethersfield area for many decades to come.●

IN MEMORY OF THE OGONI 9

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I want to commemorate the anniversary of the tragic deaths of nine Nigerian activists. Two years ago this week, Mr. Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other Ogoni leaders were brutally executed by the regime of Gen. Sani Abacha.

Ken Saro-Wiwa was a renowned playwright and author, who also happened to be the president of the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People, or MOSOP. He and several other colleagues were arrested shortly after four rival Ogoni leaders were killed by a mob in May 1994. They were detained without charge for a year, until May 19, 1995. Then, after trials that are