

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY: KEYNOTE REMARKS OF DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY STUART EIZENSTAT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year on December 7 I had the privilege of attending the Excellence in Diplomacy Awards presentation luncheon sponsored by the American Academy of Diplomacy. I would like to compliment the work of the Academy in helping to maintain the high standards of proficiency in our foreign service and to provide support for the full range of our foreign policy institutions.

During the course of the luncheon meeting, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in the Bureau of European Affairs, E. Anthony Wayne, delivered the remarks of the event's Keynote Speaker, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Stuart Eizenstat who was unable to attend the event owing to the death of a family member. This member would like to commend to his colleagues the following remarks of the Deputy Secretary on the lessons learned from the statecraft of economic diplomacy.

THE IMPORTANCE OF DIPLOMACY IN THE ECONOMIC, TRADE AND FINANCIAL ARENAS

I am most grateful to the Academy for this honor. I deeply regret not being able to accept it personally, but the death of a beloved member of my family and his funeral today in Atlanta makes it impossible. It is fitting that Tony Wayne will accept the award and read my remarks, because his inspiration and collaboration have been vital to me, both in Brussels and in Washington.

In my over thirty years in government, I have continually been impressed by the excellence of our diplomatic personnel, both at home and abroad. This Academy is devoted to maintaining this high level of performance, as well as to advocating adequate support for our foreign policy institutions.

You are very fortunate to have the leadership of Joe Sisco, whose career in diplomacy, especially in the Middle East, made him a model for so many people including myself. You are also fortunate to have Bruce Laingen, who has combined remarkable ability with a very high degree of personal courage.

The last decades of the century that will shortly be passing have been marked by an expansion of the importance of diplomacy in the economic, trade and financial arenas. This is not to say there was no such activity before. The Marshall Plan, of which Secretary Acheson was a leading architect, was an economic program that required considerable diplomatic coordination to accomplish its historic purpose. And I will remember when Margaret Thatcher came to Washington to plead with President Reagan to lower U.S. interest rates, which were drain-

ing investment funds out of Europe. But on the whole, economic matters have traditionally been the stepchild of diplomacy and of the State Department. Today they have become central to statecraft.

As just a few illustrations, the successful integration of Russia and China into the international community depends heavily upon their economic success and openness. What the IMF does with Russia will be every bit as important to that country's future as the kind of arms control program it accepts.

Chinese entry into the WTO will require enormous changes in the way that country works economically. The Middle East peace process will have difficulty succeeding unless it delivers economic benefits in real time, particularly to core constituencies in Jordan, the West Bank and Gaza.

And peace in the Balkans will depend in large part upon the success of economic reconstruction being mapped out by the IPI's donor countries and by the states of the region.

My observations on diplomacy have been shaped, of course, by my own experience, which has concentrated in the economic area. In this Administration, I have been the chief or a principal negotiator for the following:

The New Transatlantic Agenda which set the framework for the economic and political relationship between the European Union and the U.S. and which developed a mechanism—the Senior Level Group—to help to resolve differences before they become crises and to make this semiannual EU-U.S. summits more substantive and meaningful.

The Japan Port Agreement, which avoided retaliatory shutdowns of transportation facilities here are in Japan;

The negotiations with the European Union and Russia over investment in Iran under the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act are on-going. We will review the petroleum sector projects and the Secretary will determine whether they would qualify for waivers. The waivers depend on the EU's continued export controls on high-tech exports to Iran, and to aggressive fighting of terrorism.

The Kyoto Global Warming Protocol to reduce the dangerous buildup of greenhouse gas emissions that threaten our global environment.

Two extended negotiations with the EU over Cuba sanctions. The first, in 1996, led to the EU taking a Common Position on Cuba that tied closer relations to an improvement in human rights and democracy in that regime and clearing the way for the series of Presidential waivers of sanctions under Title III of the Helms-Burton Act. In the second, in 1998, the EU nations committed to restricting official government support for investments by companies in property that had been illegally confiscated by the Cuban government, and to refrain from giving export and investment subsidies to any of their companies that were investing in property that Cuba had illegally expropriated. Implementation of this Understanding is contingent on our obtaining waiver authority from the Congress under Title Four of Helms-Burton.

And, over the last two years, a series of negotiations on assets and claims relating to

World War II and the Holocaust including funds in Swiss banks, Swiss gold, life insurance policies, restitution of stolen art, and compensation to survivors for forced and slave labor performed for German industry under the Nazi regime.

I have been peripherally involved in many other negotiations from the end game of the Uruguay trade round to the WTO meetings in Seattle to the MAI negotiations at the OECD. My observation from these experiences is that the essential qualities that make a good negotiator do not differ between economic diplomacy and political diplomacy.

Both require patience, persistence, creativity, a command of the facts, the ability to argue persuasively, to know when to speak and when to be silent, to respect the position of the other side and while understanding your own country's bottom line needs, to sense what others really need to stay at the table and enter the end game.

At times it may be necessary to conjure up phrases which each side can interpret in its own way, although this is hardly desirable. In the end, both sides must be able to proclaim victory, and neither concedes defeat if negotiations are to succeed.

The chief differences between economic and political diplomacy, as I see them, are in the externals. Since the United States in modern times has never had designs on the territory of other nations, traditional diplomacy could have noble motives: keeping the peace, advancing human rights, improving the lot of poor nations.

But in the economic sphere, we are competitive with other nations for contracts and markets. Thus economic diplomacy often runs the risk of appearing to impose imposing American standards, culture, and ownership and comes under fire for that reason. Economic diplomacy must also be more responsive to domestic interest groups, because it regularly impacts their concerns and their constituencies in a more direct way.

For this very reason, Congress tends to take a more direct, more proprietary interest in economic issues than they do in the more traditional issues of diplomacy, in which the President is generally allowed to take the lead under his Constitutional prerogative to conduct foreign relations unless, as in Viet Nam in the sixties or Central America in the seventies, they go very badly. These factors complicate economic negotiations, and limit the leeway the Executive possesses in negotiations.

Economic diplomacy is going to become even more complicated over the next several decades, for several reasons. First, NGOs have become more visible, assertive and expert in what had previously been an often arcane and elite arena. Second, developing countries are no longer content to have the rules of the game dictated to them by a few large developed economies. The MAI negotiations in the OECD imploded because of NGO and LDC demands.

The Ministerial in Seattle and the global warming talks in Kyoto were complicated by these factors. We have learned we cannot and should not negotiate around either group.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

We must listen to, respect and attempt to accommodate at least some of their legitimate concerns without compromising our own goals and interests. Allowing them in will help ensure the acceptability and sustainability of whatever agreements can be made.

Third, the economic sphere will see increasing multilateral negotiations rather than traditional bilateral agreements. A global economy requires global, multinational negotiations. However, the continued divisions between Northern and Southern hemispheres will make them excruciatingly difficult.

I was struck, at both Kyoto and Seattle, by the ferocity of distrust notwithstanding the fact that developing countries are almost universally desirous of foreign investment, and by the extent to which many of them are still deeply suspicious of developed countries and see their interests fundamentally different from ours, despite the degree to which we bore the global economy on our shoulders during the recent financial crises.

Under such circumstances, talks are often unable to construct agreements that rise above the lowest common denominator. I have also learned some hard lessons from the sanctions negotiations in which I have been so deeply engaged.

Unilateral sanctions rarely work, although they must be resorted to at times to defend U.S. values. Multilateral sanctions, while far harder to fashion, are the only ones likely to achieve the desired results in terms of changing target country behavior.

Sanctions should be targeted to the state or entity whose behavior we are trying to change rather than to companies from third countries who are investing or trading there, as much as we might oppose their involvement. Third countries see such sanctions as extraterritorial. It is also critically important that sanctions legislation contain a provision for Presidential waiver authority, to protect the national interest and provide negotiating leverage.

Let me finally say a few personal words, as a non-career politically appointed diplomat to a roomful of men and women who have devoted their lives to the art of diplomacy. I have learned during the Clinton Administration, even more than as President Carter's chief domestic advisor, what a privilege it is to represent the United States both as an Ambassador and in international negotiations around the world.

The power, the majesty, the moral values, and the influence of our nation gives anyone negotiating for the United States a greater ability to accomplish his or her goals than would be possible representing any other country. These are precious resources, which we must husband, nurture and deploy in ways that do not dissipate our innate advantage.

I hope in the next century, the United States will, through the art of diplomacy, use its enormous capacity to do good to make this a better world.

I am especially honored by this award, not because I am receiving it myself, but because it recognizes the work of the economic officers, both in the State Department in Washington and in our embassies abroad. It is a signal of the increasing importance of economics as a diplomatic tool of American foreign policy.

Thank you for your award, and continue in your important work.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE HEALTH CARE FAIRNESS ACT OF 1999

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in February 1999, the Institute of Medicine issued a report concluding that federal efforts to research cancer in minority communities are insufficient. The report concluded that more resources are needed in this area and that a strategic plan is needed to coordinate this research.

In June of 1999, the Commonwealth Fund reported that minority Americans lag behind on nearly every health indicator, including health care coverage, access to care, life expectancy and disease rates. Just in terms of health care access, 45 percent of Hispanic adults, 41 percent of Asian American adults, and 35 percent of African American adults reported difficulty in accessing health care. The report also cited the statistics nearly half of Hispanic adults, more than one third of African American adults and more than 40 percent of Asian American adults report difficulty paying for medical care.

Last October, the Kaiser Family Foundation released a national survey showing that minority groups have concerns about the quality of health care they are receiving.

The common line of these reports is that there is a disparity that exists when it comes to health care for minorities.

Although we have made great advances in science and medicine, not all American citizens have shared in the benefits of these advances. Furthermore, despite the knowledge of these alarming statistics, we have not made the commitment that is necessary to understanding how barriers to health care or genetic and behavioral differences affect the outcomes of our community.

This new legislation (the Health Care Fairness Act of 1999) lays out a plan to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in health care and health outcomes. By elevating the Office of Research on Minority Health to create a Center for Health Disparities Research at the National Institutes of Health, we will significantly increase the support for research on health disparities, including data collection relating to race and ethnicity and funding major increases in minority medical training and curriculum development.

We need to make a serious effort to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in this country. As the Chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus, I am extremely pleased to join with Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the leaders of the Hispanic and Black Caucuses in support of the passage of "Fair Care".

February 7, 2000

CONGRATULATING THE KAREN ANN QUINLAN HOSPICE ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 2000

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Karen Ann Quinlan Hospice on its 20th year of operation. The Quinlan family has turned the desperate personal tragedy they shared with the world into a caring, compassionate program to help others faced with the impending loss of a loved one. The courage and faith they have shown is extraordinary.

As a girl, Karen Ann Quinlan was a vibrant athlete who taught her younger brother to wrestle. As a young woman, she had a beautiful voice and dreamed of becoming a singer.

In 1975, however, Karen Ann Quinlan's name quickly became a by-word for the legal and ethical dilemmas surrounding the treatment of terminally ill patients. On April 15 of that year, 21-year-old Karen Ann suffered cardiac arrest. Doctors saved her life but she suffered brain damage and lapsed into a "chronic persistent vegetative state." Accepting doctors' judgment that there was no hope of recovering, but frustrated by their refusal to remove Karen Ann from her respirator because signs of brain activity continued, her parents sought court permission to disconnect the respirator.

In 1976, the New Jersey Supreme Court handed down a landmark decision giving Joe and Julia Quinlan the right to remove their daughter from the respirator that assisted her breathing. The respirator was removed and Karen Ann remained alive but comatose another nine years at a Morris County nursing home before her death June 11, 1985.

As a result of their personal tragedy, the Quinlans established the Karen Ann Quinlan Memorial Foundation in order to offer a community program to help families in similar challenges. The result was the Karen Ann Quinlan Hospice, which opened in Newton on April 15, 1980, the fifth anniversary of Karen's accident. The mission of the hospice is to afford all terminally ill individuals the opportunity to die in dignity and comfort in a home setting surrounded by the people they love. Services are offered without regard to ability to pay and include bereavement support for family and friends after a patient's death, and community education about terminal illness.

The non-profit Hospice is accredited by the Community Health Accreditation Program and has received national commendations on its quality of care. More than 300 patients and family utilized the Hospice last year, bringing the total to more than 3,500 since it opened. Some 76 percent of the patients served have suffered from cancer, but others have suffered cardiac, renal, respiratory, and kidney complications, as well as Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, Karen Ann Quinlan was the first modern icon of the right-to-die debate. The widespread news coverage, two books, and a movie helped spread the word internationally of the challenges facing a family when a loved one is stricken by a terminal illness. Her precedent-setting legal case paved the way for the living will, advance directives,