

agreements through an expedited procedure known as fast track.

Fast track is a tool with which the President can negotiate international trade agreements. It is not a tool for the President to circumvent Congress and implement agreements. Congress retains its constitutional authority to approve any trade agreement brought under fast track, and maintains its responsibility to write and approve legislation to implement that agreement. I want to stress this important point: Congress still must approve or disapprove any new trade agreement reached as a result of fast track negotiations.

Fast track is a tool that the President will use to negotiate trade agreements to open foreign markets for U.S. exports. Exports are a crucial sector of the U.S. economy, particularly in southern California. Last year alone, California exported \$104 billion in goods. California exports support 1.5 million jobs, a number which is expected to grow at 100,000 per year. These are high-growth, well-paying jobs, with wages paying 13 to 16 percent more than nontrade related jobs. The President will use fast track to open up foreign markets for our exports, which will, in turn, create even more of these high-paying jobs. This is extremely important to the continued growth of the U.S. economy in general, and California's economy specifically.

The President will use this authority to open foreign markets for U.S. manufactured and agricultural products. These trade agreements will be designed to lower foreign tariff rates and barriers to entry in order to make our products more competitive in foreign marketplaces. If we are unable to negotiate these agreements, tariffs on our goods will remain high, and consumers in foreign markets will be unwilling to buy U.S. products that are made and grown in our districts.

I am extremely disappointed that labor and environmental organizations are erroneously characterizing fast track as a new trade agreement lacking sufficient labor and environmental protections. I cannot repeat enough times: fast track is simply a negotiating process under which the President negotiates trade agreements—with the constant advice and oversight of Congress—that Congress must approve in order to become law.

It is also important to recognize that fast track does not, I repeat does not, preclude the President from addressing environmental and labor concerns in any trade agreement, so long as those labor and environmental concerns are related to trade. The fact is, we encourage the President to address these issues, especially those which hurt the competitiveness of our exports abroad.

I also want to point out that this is not a partisan issue: every President in the last 20 years has had fast-track authority. Democrat-controlled Congresses have granted the authority to Republican Presidents and vice versa. Every president since Gerald Ford has had fast-track authority to negotiate trade agreements. Without this authority, no foreign countries will enter into trade negotiations with the United States.

Finally, I want to make clear that granting fast track does not give the President a blank check to expand NAFTA. Any new trade agreement—including NAFTA parity for countries in Central and South America—must still come before Congress for approval and implementation. If Congress feels that a trade deal

is not in the United States' best interest, Congress will vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. If we do not grant our President fast-track negotiating authority, we will only serve to hurt ourselves. Export markets will dry up, and we will lose all those U.S. jobs associated with exports. Please vote for fair U.S. trade. Please vote for U.S. jobs. Please vote for fast track.

FORUM ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, I convened a forum on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. This legislation, which would renew authority for most Federal higher education programs, will be considered during the next session of the 105th Congress. I invited students, college presidents, financial aid administrators, and business leaders from the Research Triangle area of North Carolina to come together at the Museum of History in Raleigh to discuss the future of student and institutional aid, support services for disadvantaged students, international programs, university-based research, and training for the work force. The participants were divided into four panels: "The Higher Education Act: Student Perspectives," "Priorities for the Higher Education Act," "The Financial Aid Challenge," and "Higher Education, the Economy and the Global Marketplace." Together, they outlined a compelling agenda for education policy and demonstrated the contribution our State is prepared to make to this debate.

I was joined on the moderating panel by David Longanecker, Assistant Secretary for Post-Secondary Education at the U.S. Department of Education, Senator Howard Lee, chairman of both the authorizing and appropriating committees for higher education in the North Carolina Senate, and Senator Wib Gulley, a member of the Higher Education Committee in the North Carolina Senate. Today, I want to summarize who the participants were and what they had to say.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT: STUDENT PERSPECTIVES

Five students from Triangle schools gave us the benefit of their perspectives on student aid. Mohan Nathan, student body president at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, emphasized four significant areas of concern for students: First, the grant-loan imbalance; second, the importance of the State Student Incentive Grant Program in leveraging non-Federal funds; third, the rising cost of graduate school and subsequent student debt; and fourth, how loan indebtedness may affect the career choices students make. Linda Hawkins, a student at Meredith College, spoke of the special needs of nontraditional students and supported more evening and weekend programs that would allow flexibility in family and employment schedules. Kendrick Coble of Shaw University recounted the difficulty of piecing together a financial aid package and called for a modification in the methodology used to determine financial aid eligibility so

that those who are working to support themselves are not penalized. Heather Thompson, a student at Durham Technical Community College and single mother of two children, testified in very personal and moving terms to the importance of the Single Parent Program—a program offered at Durham Tech which pays for her children's day care—in attracting more single parents back to school. And Terry Steckowich, a transfer student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, discussed the difficulty in transferring credits from a quarter-based institution—in his case, Durham Technical Community College—to a semester based system.

PRIORITIES FOR THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Leaders from five higher education institutions in the Triangle comprised the second panel. They offered their views on challenges at their institutions and how those challenges should frame the priorities in the renewal of the Higher Education Act. President Molly Broad of the University of North Carolina system called for modification of the College Work Study Program to cover travel and training expenses for students who are participating in cooperative education. She also described the need to develop telecommunications infrastructure and support through expanded partnerships among colleges, primary and secondary schools. President Broad also testified to the importance of policy initiatives that were included as a portion of the Taxpayer Relief Act. She specifically referenced the importance of two items that I and other Members have been working on for 10 years which were included in the education tax relief section of the bill—penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts and the deductibility of interest on student loans. President Bernard Franklin of St. Augustine's college emphasized the accessibility and cost of a college education, citing the grant-loan imbalance and advocating an increase in Pell Grant levels. Second, he called for greater support of the technological infrastructure for colleges serving a large number of minority students. Third, Dr. Franklin addressed the need for increased funding and flexibility so that money in the Institutional Aid portion of the bill can be used to build endowments at historically black institutions. Chancellor Julius Chambers of North Carolina Central University urged more funding to help develop graduate programs at historically black colleges and universities. He raised questions about the restrictive matching fund component of the law and stressed the difficulty graduate programs have in becoming eligible for Federal funds. He also discussed the need for better outreach to low-income families concerning the Federal funds available for education. Chancellor Chambers went on to argue that the present method for determining the amount of money married students and students with children may obtain for loans and other aid is not sufficient. He argued in favor of increased Federal student loan funding to help single parents cover the expenses necessary to obtain a degree. President Bruce Howell of Wake Technical Community College, with whom I worked a few years ago as we crafted the Advanced Technological Education Program at the National Science Foundation, testified to the value of the grants his and other community colleges across the country have received to upgrade curricula and teaching

methods. He called for more resources, including computers, and increased access to the classroom for the economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, single parent students, and full-time workers. Because 78 percent of students at Wake Tech work, Dr. Howell advocated the need for classes round the clock and on weekends. He also spoke on the necessity to reach out to workers and older people to make education accessible at all stages of life. The last panelist to present testimony was President Nan Keohane of Duke University. Dr. Keohane echoed the statement of Chancellor Chambers in addressing the lack of knowledge about the availability of student aid. She detailed a number of areas where changes to the Higher Education Act would "play what you might call a perfecting role." These refinements include a sharper focus on needy and moderate income students, strengthening campus-based programs that reduce borrowing, lowering the cost of borrowing to students, allowing institutions with low-loan default rates greater flexibility in the loan packages they may offer, and developing incentives for families to save for college. I believe this last point is particularly important and hope the reauthorization will adjust the formulas to ensure those that have saved are not penalized while ensuring that those with fewer resources are still eligible for aid. Finally, Dr. Keohane called for adequate support of the International Education and Foreign Language Programs and for rethinking of Federal student aid for participants in those programs.

THE FINANCIAL AID CHALLENGE

Financial aid administrators, in both State government and at Triangle educational institutions, discussed the current status of the Federal Financial Aid Program and the challenges they face in administering the program. Steven Brooks, executive director of the North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority, discussed the difficulty aid administrators have in fulfilling their role as student advocates. Mr. Brooks indicated that Federal regulations and decreased flexibility have made his role as an advocate more difficult. Like Drs. Chambers and Keohane, he argued that a better partnership among administrators at the Federal, State, and institutional level would help make financial aid information more available to students. He also addressed the grant-loan imbalance and, like other participants, called for an increase in Pell grant funding. Finally, Mr. Brooks asked that the Congress continue to find ways to support the savings efforts of middle-class families. "Those who can afford to save for higher education, must be encouraged to do so, and this encouragement must come without cost to those who cannot afford to save." Carolyn Braxton, financial aid director at Wake Technical Community College, discussed the need for options other than loans, so students do not have large debt loans upon graduation. She also expressed the need for more child care, especially for the nontraditional student. And like Mr. Brooks, Ms. Braxton would like more focus on low-income families, not just aid for the middle class. She concluded by questioning the role of financial aid administrators in relation to Federal requirements: "Financial aid professionals are required to be gatekeepers for Federal, State, and local dollars at our colleges, meet the needs of our students and meet regulatory requirements in administering

these dollars. Requirements for verifying selective service registration and citizenship are not in sync with our mission to provide funding resources to enable all students to obtain a higher education." Julia Rice Mallette, financial aid director at North Carolina State University, brought several issues to the table. She underscored the need to understand the costs of college beyond tuition: books, room and board, food and transportation. She, too, expressed concern about the grant-loan imbalance and called for increased funding for the Pell Grant Program. At the same time, Ms. Mallette called for an increase in loan limits, especially for graduate and professional students, as well as a reduction or elimination of the loan originating fee and insurance premium paid up front. And, finally, Mr. Mallette reiterated the need to clarify and promote financial aid opportunities for students enrolled in distance education programs. Wanda White, financial aid director at St. Augustine's College, discussed the importance of programs such as the recently enacted Hope Scholarship, deductibility of student loan interest, and increases in the Pell Grant and the Work Study Program, since as many as 90 percent of students at historically black colleges and universities receive some sort of financial aid. She also advocated the increased funding to expand the use of technology at institutions that serve minorities and spoke for increased funding for the State Student Incentive Grant Program.

HIGHER EDUCATION, THE ECONOMY AND THE GLOBAL MARKETPLACE

Business and education leaders came together in our final panel to discuss the implications of higher education policy decisions for local and global economies. Chancellor Larry Monteith of North Carolina State University highlighted the growing partnership between industry and university research and stressed the importance of these partnerships for future industrial development. This is a subject he is well acquainted with because of his leadership in creating the new Centennial Campus at NCSU, a research and advanced technology community where university, industry, and government partners interact in multidisciplinary programs directed toward the solution of contemporary problems. It serves as a model for how productive partnerships between industry and universities should be formed for the 21st century. Chancellor Monteith expressed his concern that the Higher Education Act not forget research and research institutions: "If the infrastructure will not support leading-edge research, then we will not generate the technologies that are needed." President Phail Wynn of Durham Technical Community College testified that 80 percent of the goods produced in this country are actively competing with foreign-made goods, and he argued that "the real measure of success between these competing knowledge-intensive economies will be found in the quality of their human resources." Postsecondary schooling must address the needs of the workplace, Dr. Wynn stated, especially in terms of being able to adapt quickly to changing circumstances. Steven Hitchner, director of ECPI Technical Institute, a proprietary school which focuses on teaching computer skills, made two important points. The first was the need for an increased numbers of technologically literate workers. He testified that "increasingly, employers are requiring specialized

training and continuing education as system advances are made and new technology is introduced." The second was the necessity to give proprietary school students access to Federal student assistance programs. To ensure that schools such as ECPI are able to produce the skilled work force we need quickly, Mr. Hitchner believes proprietary schools must be included in the discussions about reforming the Higher Education Act. He also expressed his appreciation that the recently enacted Taxpayer Relief Act included proprietary schools in the HOPE Scholarship Program and in the Education Affordability Act provisions concerning deductible interest for student loans and penalty-free withdrawals from IRA's. Robert Ingram, President and CEO of Glaxo-Wellcome Incorp., testified from two perspectives: global employer and corporate citizen. As an employer, he stressed the need for "graduates to help us fulfill our mission of discovering, developing and delivering better medicines to meet the unmet answers in health." As a corporate citizen who believes in higher education, Mr. Ingram highlighted Glaxo's commitment to research universities and his company's emphasis on research partnerships. He testified that these partnerships, which are extensive at Triangle institutions, are essential to producing the most qualified and competitive students. He further discussed the need for advanced technical training for the work force to meet the evolving needs of an increasingly complex global business economy. Sandra Babb, advisor on work force preparedness to the Governor of North Carolina, argued persuasively for meeting the requirements of the digital information economy. Ms. Babb testified that educators and students must look to see where business is moving in terms of technology and creativity and must focus on the skills necessary to accomplish those goals. She emphasized that education is not static and that the Higher Education Act needs to realize this fundamental change in how we educate our citizens. She stated "learning is a lifelong challenge because in the new economy, you've got to reinvent your knowledge base throughout your life." The last witness was William Friday, president-emeritus of the University of North Carolina system. Mr. Friday also chaired the National Humanities Center Steering Committee on the Future of the Fulbright Educational Exchange Program. That committee recently produced an excellent report entitled "Fulbright at Fifty," which makes the case for the continuation and enhancement of the Fulbright scholars program. Mr. Friday testified "if we do not devise the means to utilize the strength of these higher education institutions in helping one culture to understand another, one culture to get along with another, one culture to be unafraid of another, then all that you've heard here will not avail." He also paraphrased Senator Fulbright when he said "knowledge will not produce peace unless there is understanding." And to reach that understanding, Mr. Friday passionately advocated the restoration of Fulbright funding to \$125 million. Unfortunately, the recently enacted Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations bill funded the Fulbright program at a much lower level, \$94.236 million.

After this full day of presentations and responses to questions posed by Secretary Longanecker, Senators Lee and Gulley, and

myself, I believe we all have a better understanding of the enormity of the challenge of reauthorizing the Higher Education Act and of the major issues that must be addressed. The hearing record will be made available to our colleagues on the Education and Workforce Committee, and I will be eager to work with them to ensure that these excellent ideas from the Research Triangle area of North Carolina are included in the Higher Education Act as reauthorization moves forward next session.

FAST TRACK AUTHORITY: A
FRAUDULENT NAME AND GAME

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the issue most are debating today is whether Congress should give the President fast-track authority to negotiate trade agreements with foreign governments. At least, that is how the issue is usually described and debated.

But there is a real problem in both the description and the debate. And the closer you look at it, the clearer it becomes that the description is misleading and the debate often fraudulent.

First, there is nothing inherently faster about trade agreements reached under this process. In fact, we often spend more time and energy discussing fast track than we do the actual trade agreements. Second, the President does not obtain some new authority from Congress to negotiate trade deals; he has plenary authority under the Constitution to negotiate any agreement he might want with other nations. Indeed, the only question extant is whether Congress will try to relinquish or forfeit its constitutional authority to propose amendments to any proposal that the President might reach with other nations. Hence, the issue is not whether Congress will give the President any authority; it is whether Congress will give up its own constitutional authority.

So what is fraudulent about this debate? First, so-called fast-track authority is constitutionally unenforceable. Congress cannot legislatively give up its constitutional power to make laws or its powers to determine how to go about making laws. Surely, Congress can pass a law purporting to bind itself and future Congresses on a future issue, as fast-track purports to do, but, it cannot be enforced. This Congress and future Congresses could always simply ignore such previous actions and offer amendments at any time to any bill.

Second, even assuming such a limiting law could be enforced, neither this nor any previous fast-track proposal would actually eliminate congressional amendments to proposed trade bills. For every fast-track bill ever considered or proposed contains a glaring exception in the fine print making it say, in essence, that there will be no amendments unless the House or Senate passes a rule permitting amendments. In other words, the fast-track bills basically say that Congress will not consider amendments to a bill unless Congress decides to consider amendments to such a bill. So who's kidding whom? The answer is that just about everyone is fooling everyone. Such a loophole renders the law virtually meaningless, except, of course, to the extent

it deceives foreign negotiators and the U.S. Congress.

What is really happening here is a convergence of interests between the U.S. Presidents and foreign governments. Their understandable mutual desire is to minimize the role of that cumbersome, bothersome thing called Congress.

In effect, they would have us say that for purposes of trade our constitutional system of representation does not work, cannot work, and must be circumvented. Instead, they would have us adopt a parliamentary system for trade laws, making the President a de facto Prime Minister and making the de facto parliament's vote really a simple "yes" or "no" vote of confidence in the Prime Minister's leadership. This would not even be a vote on the merits of the trade deal, or even on support of a given President, but instead on support of the Office of the Presidency. That's not what the Constitution envisioned or envisions.

Lastly, every bill implementing trade agreements submitted under fast-track authority in the past has been put through a rigorous preliminary amendment process in the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees. These sessions have resulted in huge numbers of amendments; then, after the committee members have offered their amendments and voted on them, the amended end product is submitted by the President to the entire Congress. That bill is then brought forward for the "yes" or "no" vote envisioned under fast track.

Thus, the debate on fast track has been riddled with fraud—fraud on foreign governments, on the Congress and on the body politic. I think we should deal with the issues openly and honestly. We can't give up our constitutional authority; we never have; and if we pass the President's fast-track proposal, we still wouldn't give up our authority. Having come to know this, I have chosen not to participate in the perpetuation of the fraud.

Some will say that a vote against fast track is a vote against global trade; that opposing fast track is putting America last, not first; that a vote against fast track is being protectionist. To those, I say, "nonsense." These ad hominem attacks and false dichotomies sully the debate and are not worthy of a response. One can oppose fast track and still strongly favor global trade. I do. One can object to fast track and also oppose protectionism, seeking to put America first. I do. And one can support constitutional processes and still support enactment of trade agreements, as I supported the Canadian-American Free-Trade Agreement, the continuance of MFN for China, various iterations of GATT, the WTO, and so forth. I'd rather do that than support and perpetuate what is an essentially fraudulent process.

MEXICAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an article concerning the Mexican political system by Mr. C. Allen Ellis, the president of Ellis Interfin Services, Ltd.

MEXICO AT WATERSHED

On July 6 Mexico, with over 30 million of its 52 million registered voters participating, held congressional elections for all 500 members of its Chamber of Deputies, to replace one third of its Senate, and to elect a mayor of its vast capital city for the first time. The result was historic. Mexico's 65 year old one-party political system, led by a one term president having near absolute power, crumbled before an electorate slowly emerging from Mexico's worst political and economic crisis since its Revolution of 1910.

The immediate results have been the end of congressional dominance by the "Partido Revolucionario Institucional" (PRI), which now holds a minority of 239 seats in the 500 member lower chamber, and a former party opposition holding 261 seats, which has formed a working coalition at least for the present. The opposition majority is asserting itself in seeking basic prerogatives and is developing fundamental changes in congressional rules and procedures to limit the vast powers held by the president since 1928. In addition, a leftist opposition party, the PRD, has elected Cuauhtemoc Cárdenas, son of a populist former president, to govern as mayor of Mexico City's Federal District for a three year term along with a 40 member Council, of which 38 are members of his party and to which not a single P.I. candidate was elected.

President Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de León, midway through his single 6 year term of office, has emerged as a principal beneficiary of the elections whose fairness and extent of voter participation were unique in Mexico's electoral history. This success was the product of the newly independent Federal Electoral Institute, a vocal and critical press and media, the availability of public funding for all political parties, and, in general, President Zedillo's insistence on a fair and democratic election at the expense of his own presidential powers.

The emergence of a politically significant Congress has been accomplished without formal changes in the Constitution of 1917 or the laws of Mexico. Among the initial political changes that could prove to be more than transient are: limiting of our neighbor's "spoils system" whereby sitting presidents, their relatives and close political and private sector associates can amass great wealth, the greater sharing of presidential power with state and municipal governments many led by opposition parties (6 of Mexico's 31 states and hundreds of municipalities), and a stronger Supreme Court no longer serving only at presidential pleasure.

The new political system which is emerging is accompanying an economic recovery from the "Crisis" of 1995 and early 1996, led by the export sector principally benefiting approximately 200 major companies and their domestic and foreign suppliers, and, in stark contrast, a slow and painful recovery of its domestic economy. Mexico's two-way trade with its United States and Canada NAFTA partners has increased by 67% in three years from \$91 billion to \$152 billion in 1996, with Mexico this year expected to supplant Japan as the second most important trading partner of the United States after Canada. This year United States exports to Mexico are once again accelerating after their dramatic fall in 1995 (resulting from the "Crisis" and the December, 1994 devaluation of the peso), at \$32.7 billion for the first six months running 23% ahead of the same period in 1996.

Thus Mexico's new political system is emerging in tandem with a strengthening economy, and in a North American regional economy where the United States continues its remarkable seven year record of non-inflationary growth with massive job creation,