

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING POLICY ACT OF 1993: A NEW DOCTRINE TO PROTECT AMERICAN INTERESTS

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation, the International Peacekeeping Policy Act of 1993, to establish a comprehensive and coherent policy toward United Nations peacekeeping activities. In my role as ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, which has jurisdiction over international peacekeeping operations, I took this action to address the dangerously confused state of American foreign policy.

Like all Americans, my constituents, the people of Maine's Second District, were appalled at the carnage brought about by the Clinton administration's early attempts to establish a naive U.N.-based foreign policy. The people of Maine were even more incredulous that after the death in Somalia of 18 United States troops, two of them from my own district, President Clinton tried to send unarmed American troops to Haiti under United Nations command. Furthermore, he still has not ruled out making an open-ended commitment in Bosnia of 25,000 American peacekeepers in an extraordinarily dangerous environment. I understand the President is also considering deploying lightly armed American U.N. peacekeepers to Liberia and Mozambique, and that the State Department is studying the feasibility of sending U.N. peacekeepers to three other notorious quagmires—Afghanistan, Sudan, and Tajikistan.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have had enough. This administration has traded America's hard-fought international credibility for fuzzy minded internationalism. Recent events show the administration's current U.N.-centered foreign policy to be short-sighted and unworkable. We need a new doctrine that protects U.S. interests and does not place the lives of American soldiers at unnecessary risk. After consulting with a range of foreign policy experts and after considering the widely-reported flaws of PRD-13, the Clinton administration's draft blueprint for its U.N.-based foreign policy, I am today presenting what I believe should be the basis of this new doctrine.

Before discussing the contents of my legislation, I would like to emphasize that ultimately, foreign policy can only be implemented by the President. Congress has the constitutional power over peace and war, Congress can block ill-conceived initiatives through law or by cutting off funds, and Congress is a critical avenue for building broad public support for any policy initiative. But only the President can articulate and implement a coherent American foreign policy.

The President must also ultimately take responsibility for the actions and advice of those who serve him in senior foreign policy positions. It is the President who must decide the extent to which those senior foreign policy advisors responsible for his failed U.N.-based foreign policy continue to serve him and the Nation well. The President must decide whether they can turn aside from that approach and implement a new policy that focuses instead upon core U.S. national interests. The International Peacekeeping Policy Act is neither an infringement upon the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief nor his constitutional authority to conduct American foreign policy. It is also no substitute for the kind of foreign policy leadership that has proved to be so lacking in this administration. The bill does, however, use the Congress' fundamental responsibility over the appropriate use of U.S. Government funds to establish prudent criteria for United States financial support for United Nations peacekeeping activities.

The United States must adopt realistic perceptions of what peacekeeping is, what it can accomplish and when—if ever—American troops should participate in United Nations peacekeeping operations. To make these determinations, we must learn from history and 30 years of experience in peacekeeping operations which have been attempted to date.

1. RECOGNIZE THE LIMITATIONS OF U.N. PEACEKEEPING

First, we must realize that U.N. peacekeeping is a limited conflict resolution mechanism that will only succeed in a small number of international disputes. History shows that peacekeeping operations only work when they are noncoercive efforts to resolve an international—rather than internal—dispute. Peacekeeping forces cannot compel warring parties to abide by peace accords, and can only be prudently deployed with the full consent of all parties to a conflict. Peacekeeping will thus usually fail in civil and ethnic conflicts, a fact that was amply demonstrated in the Congo in the mid-1960's, Lebanon in the mid-1980's, Somalia in 1993, Haiti in 1993, and Yugoslavia over the past 2 years.

My legislation will return U.N. peacekeeping to its original purpose by establishing strict conditions under which U.S. peacekeeping funds may be used. If an international emergency endangers U.S. national interests, the President remains able to take quick action through his powers as Commander-in-Chief. If the situation is less time critical and the President wants to pay the United Nations for a peacekeeping operation that does not qualify under this law, he may always seek a specific authorization from Congress. The bill would also control the explosive growth in the cost of U.N. peacekeeping by ending the United Nation's practice of overbilling the United States for this function and to require prior congressional notification for the establishment of any new peacekeeping operation.

2. U.S. TROOPS MUST NOT SERVE UNDER U.N. COMMAND

The United States must recognize that American combat troops should normally not participate in peacekeeping operations. The issue is not, as President Clinton would have us believe, that U.N. command and control procedures must be improved before Americans are permitted to serve under U.N. commanders. We should not even think of placing American servicemen and women under its control. The real lesson the President should have learned from his Somalia debacle and prior U.N. operations is that United Nations peacekeeping missions achieved some measure of success during the cold war only when they were seen as neutral and nonthreatening. For this reason in 1956 the United Nations began a wise policy of excluding United States and Soviet troops from peacekeeping operations because the United Nations believed American and Soviet troops would never be seen as neutral in peacekeeping situations.

The appalling pictures we saw on television last month of Somalis desecrating the bodies of American soldiers in the back alleys of Mogadishu teaches a hard lesson most United States military officers already knew: Americans, when they serve as peacekeepers, stand out. They are not seen as neutral, idealistic international civil servants. They are seen as representatives of the world's sole remaining superpower. Thus, when deployed as lightly armed U.N. peacekeepers, American troops are frequently in a bind. They are at great risk of falling victim to terrorism and violence while their military skills are often wasted.

American troops must be reserved for real military situations where they can best utilize their superior military training and technology. Most Americans did not oppose using large numbers of well-armed American troops in situations such as in Panama in 1990, Grenada in 1985, or Kuwait in 1991. The critical consideration must be whether such an operation serves American national and security interests and whether such operations have the full support of the American people, have identifiable goals and are "winnable." Traditional peacekeeping missions are most effective when staffed by the states that can do them best—countries without our kind of global foreign policy interests which only complicates the mission. The International Peacekeeping Policy Act would prohibit United States combat forces from serving under formal United Nations command.

3. PROTECT AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION

If it is necessary to provide intelligence to the United Nations for peacekeeping, such intelligence should be provided only if sensitive sources and methods of intelligence gathering are protected, and only on a case-by-case basis. At the urging of this administration, last summer the United Nations established its own intelligence service. We are currently giving computer terminals and fax machines to

● 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.

U.N. headquarters in New York and to U.N. peacekeeping operations abroad to facilitate passing sensitive American intelligence to the United Nations. At U.N. headquarters alone, hundreds of officials from over 50 countries have access to the information we are providing. The results of this effort have been predictable. Reports have surfaced that the United Nations, an organization which retains strong anti-American currents and continues to suffer from corruption and inefficiency, has leaked some of the crucial intelligence we have provided, possibly seriously compromising American national security and human lives. My bill would restrict intelligence sharing with the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, we still live in a dangerous world. Make no mistake, the world's thugs have taken solace in our country's recent foreign policy fiascoes. If the ineptitude of American foreign policy continues, small problems will continue to escalate into major foreign policy disasters and serious security concerns will grow to threaten global stability. Just last month, the Bosnian Serbs resumed their shelling of Sarajevo. Iran and North Korea have serious aspirations of becoming nuclear weapons states. And who knows what Pol Pot or Mommar Qaddafi are planning. My proposed new doctrine on international peacekeeping will help to salvage American foreign policy, protect U.S. interests abroad, and prevent American soldiers from continuing to risk their lives on questionable U.N. missions.

A TRIBUTE TO DANIEL "BUD"
MCKENNEY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to share with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives the passing of Daniel "Bud" McKenney. A fellow citizen concerned about the youth of our community, Mr. McKenney helped to establish the Delaware Head Start and Foster Grandparents Programs. Realizing that young people are our most precious resource, he worked tirelessly to ensure that all of their needs were met. The Head Start Program provided hot meals and early education for needy children and the Foster Grandparents Program matched senior citizens and residents of an institution of mentally retarded adults for interaction and understanding. He served as a volunteer counselor with the Girls Club of Delaware, currently called Girls, Inc.

Early in his career, Mr. McKenney served as press secretary to then Delaware Governor, Elbert Carvel and was a part of the historic Delaware delegation that met with President John F. Kennedy in the Oval Office of the White House to discuss economic development in the Delaware region. Mr. McKenney was later appointed by the Governor as the first director of the State office of economic opportunity. He opened the department without an office or an operating budget.

Mr. McKenney was an Army veteran of World War II and the founder and first com-

mander of the Charles E. Durney American Legion Post 27 in Wilmington. He enjoyed numerous activities, among them reading, thoroughbred racing, and University of Delaware football. Daniel "Bud" McKenney was a family man as well. He was devoted to his wife, of 46 years, Kathryn, their 7 children, Thomas, Kerry, Christopher, Daniel, Matthew, Kevin, and Kelly and 7 grandchildren, Claire, Steven, Kate, Erin, Tierney, Amy, and Caroline. He also cherished his relationship with his two surviving sisters, Mary Turner and Ann Krauss.

It is with regret that we mark his passing, but we know that his life's works continue in the programs he started and his spirit lives on in the good works of his loving family. Mr. Speaker, please let all who knew him know that when you live a good life no one truly dies, you simply live on in the lives of those you have touched with love.

TRIBUTE TO SIGMUND
STROCHLITZ

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of an editorial paying tribute to Sigmund Strochlitz of New London, CT, on the occasion of his receiving an honorary doctor of humane letters degree from Connecticut College.

Sigmund Strochlitz is a gentleman in the finest sense, who has served his community and neighbors well, and as a Holocaust survivor, has never forgotten his past. Sigmund Strochlitz has traveled the world, dedicated to preserving the memory of those who perished during that time and preventing the spread of hatred.

SIGMUND STROCHLITZ DAY

Sigmund Strochlitz, who received an honorary doctor of humane letters degree last Monday night from Connecticut College, is very much a citizen of the world, but one who has not forgotten the importance of doing good works at home.

Born in Bendzin, Poland nearly 77 years ago, Mr. Strochlitz experienced the barbarism of the Nazi death machinery first hand in World War II.

Mr. Strochlitz, who moved to New London in the mid-1950s, is a Holocaust survivor. Because of that experience, his memory will never fully escape the horrors he witnessed almost daily in several Nazi concentration camps.

Call it good fortune, the luck of the draw, whatever. It is a mere accident of history that he, a concentration camp prisoner, is alive today. He understands this profoundly, and that is why he regularly travels the globe to keep alive the memory of that consummate evil Nazi Germany committed decades ago.

Sigmund Strochlitz has visited Pope John Paul II to appeal for support to participate in a conference dealing with the anatomy of hate. He also sought to persuade the pope to support the establishment of Days of Remembrance in Germany and France.

In Israel, he has worked for many institutions, including the Friends of Haifa University.

For four years, Mr. Strochlitz headed the Days of Remembrance effort of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. He also was chairman of the council's committee that developed the Holocaust Memorial in Washington, DC. Presidents Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan appointed and reappointed him to this work.

In New London, Mr. Strochlitz has been generous in support of various causes.

Mr. Strochlitz is a man whose efforts on behalf of others stand in sharp contrast to the evils he experienced as a prisoner in the Nazi camps. The sadness and tragedy of those days is forever with him. He speaks often of how many potential writers, scientists, musicians and doctors were among the six million individuals destroyed by the Nazis.

Like his friend, Elie Wiesel, the Nobel laureate, Mr. Strochlitz commits himself to repudiating evil where he sees it. More than that, he shares with Prof. Wiesel a commitment to exalting goodness. They know that the failure to affirm what is good or neglecting to loudly denounce what is bad, allows evil the opportunity to hatch its plots.

These two concepts from the crucible of the work done by these friends: speak out against evil, bigotry, racism, and inhumanity. Praise those who go the extra distance to help others, to speak truthfully and in behalf of what is just and honorable.

That is the splendor and joy of humanity at its best.

KEY DOCUMENTS PROVE INNOCENCE OF JOSEPH OCCHIPINTI

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing efforts to bring to light all the facts in the case of former Immigration and Naturalization Service agent Joseph Occhipinti, I submit into the RECORD additional key evidence in this case.

EXHIBIT L—AFFIDAVIT

Tony Reyes, being duly sworn, deposes and states:

(1) I am a native and citizen of the Dominican Republic presently incarcerated at the Federal Medical Center at Rochester, Minnesota for Federal drug violations.

(2) I recently learned from a reliable Dominican source that former Federal Agent Joseph Occhipinti convicted for civil rights violations was intentionally set-up by Dominican bodega owners, among others, after he refused to accept bribes during Project Bodega and instead increased his enforcement activities. These bodega owners were involved in criminal activity being investigated by Agent Occhipinti. In addition, it is reported that there was a corrupt official in Agent Occhipinti's department involved in the conspiracy.

(3) I have also developed evidence that Dominican lawyers Aranda and Gutlein are involved in ongoing drug trafficking activity, official corruption, and the conspiracy against Agent Occhipinti.

(4) I am willing to reveal the source and additional information regarding this conspiracy to appropriate law enforcement agencies.

EXHIBIT M—AFFIDAVIT

Hilda Navarro, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I reside at 5510 97th Street, Corona, New York 11368.

2. In November 1992, I accompanied my father, Peter Navarro, on a tour in Costa Rica. Also on the tour was Alfredo Placeras, who is known to me as an attorney with the Federation of Dominican Merchants and Industrialists of New York in the Washington Heights area.

3. Mr. Placeras and my father started talking about the Joseph Occhipinti case. Mr. Placeras stated, in my presence, that he was one of the individuals in Washington Heights who organized the merchants in Washington Heights to set up the case against Mr. Occhipinti.

4. Mr. Placeras further stated that it was their desire to "finish" Mr. Occhipinti.

5. Mr. Placeras further stated that he knew people "high up" in Government.

6. There was no question in my mind that Mr. Placeras' comments indicated that Mr. Occhipinti was unfairly set up by the Federation as well as other certain elements in Washington Heights.

EXHIBIT N

Apparently this particular witness learned some information, I think when you read the transcript, he couldn't have learned as an everyday citizen of the inner workings of the court system. Apparently he was given some insight as to certain things.

If you read it at your convenience, you will see certain things that may come to, that you may want to look at and pursue yourself.

Mr. JOHNSON: That's not an official translation, first of all.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: I have no problem if you get an official one.

Mr. MORDKOFKY: This document was translated by an organization called Language Lab.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: I think they are court certified.

Mr. MORDKOFKY: That was translated at great expense.

Mr. JOHNSON: I don't know what the relevance of this is now with this witness.

THE COURT: What does it say?

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: It basically says, your Honor, that judges have been changed in this case for special reasons and that certain information was given regarding the manner in which judges were changed. I think rather than mesynopsizing it, your Honor, I think it's three or four pages and if you read it it may be of interest to you. I'd like to make it on the record.

THE COURT: What does it have to do with this witness?

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: I believe there is a very close relationship with this particular interpreter and the complainants involved. And I think—

THE COURT: Do you have any proof of that?

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: Just what the tape says, your Honor, and if you read the English translation there are a few things there that I don't think a normal, everyday Spanish bodega owner would know about the inner workings of the—

Mr. JOHNSON: That's just an argument. He's trying to suggest there forever that Ms. Fernandez told the witness which he is now repeating on tape. There's no evidence of that.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: Could your Honor take a look at this?

THE COURT: No. Unless there's an official transcript of that.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: Would the government be able to provide that for you, your Honor?

THE COURT: For what purpose? What would be the purpose? First of all, I'll say on the record that this case came directly to me, I don't know that it was before any other judge ever.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: Whatever your Honor thinks is appropriate.

THE COURT: If you have some proof that there was tampering with the wheel, I'll hear that. But other than that, we're not going into it. Let's proceed.

Mr. OCCHIPINTI: Yes, your Honor.

HONORING THE YONKERS PUBLIC LIBRARY

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the entire community of Yonkers is proud to be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the Yonkers Public Library, which received its charter and began serving local residents in 1893.

What started as a small operation serving a city of 4,000 residents has grown into a large service organization meeting the needs of the fourth largest city in New York State. The library operates two branches, in Getty Square and on Central Avenue, which provide a broad range of services to the community.

Several years ago, when the Internal Revenue Service threatened to pull its tax advisory services out of Yonkers, I worked with the leadership of the Yonkers Public Library on an innovative proposal. It involved making public space at the library available to the IRS so that the people of Yonkers could receive free guidance in completing their tax forms. This was the first such arrangement of its kind in the country, and it has proven to be a great success.

It is this kind of innovative thinking that has made the Yonkers Public Library such a valuable asset to the community. The library director, Jacqueline Miller, and the entire board of trustees are to be especially commended for their efforts. I congratulate all those who have contributed to the success of the Yonkers Public Library and pledge my continued support as they embark on a second century of service.

SUPPORT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: SUPPORT CSCME

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution which seeks to promote the peace process in the Middle East by supporting creation of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Middle East [CSCME]. The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that leaders in the region should seriously consider the CSCME model as they proceed to address critical issues which continue to pose threats to peace and stability. This

resolution demonstrates our commitment to finding long-term solutions to the problems that have violently divided the Middle East for generations.

Mr. Speaker, the mutual recognition agreement reached between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization has fundamentally altered the politics of the region. Never before have the chances for peace in the region been so promising. The recent electoral victory of Jordanians who support the recent peace initiative, and the first visit of a Turkish Foreign Minister to Israel have given the process another boost. In this climate of heightened optimism, the creation of a CSCE-like process can help build upon these critical initial steps. A CSCME framework would bring strength in its persistence, in its determination to foster continued political will among its participating States and, just as important, among their citizens. The critical aspects of the CSCE process—political dialog and public participation—are also most critical in the Middle Eastern context.

I believe we are at a point where Middle Eastern nations could create such a framework for constructive dialog through which barriers to trade, travel, and communication can be removed and through which regional cooperation and stability could be established. A Middle East security framework could encourage regional security through arms control, verification, confidence building, and respect for human rights. A multilateral forum for discussion would provide an outlet for grievances and a framework for conflict resolution. States would need only be assured that participation would not prejudice their individual interests and that each State's security would be enhanced through participation in region-wide talks.

I harbor no illusions about the serious obstacles which block the road to peace in the Middle East. There are no guarantees that a CSCME could solve the complex and explosive issues in the region. I realize that the CSCE process is not without its own flaws. But we now stand at a historic juncture where long-absent political will may suddenly exist, and for the first time, nations in that region seem at least willing to engage in dialog. In such a climate, a regional negotiating framework could help foster confidence-building measures needed to develop the trust that will encourage progress on the toughest issues in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the importance of confidence building measures as a tool of reconciliation and conflict resolution. Israel's release of hundreds of Palestinian detainees offers one such example of a good faith gesture which has helped maintain the momentum of the recent peace agreement. A reciprocal step on the part of Arab governments should be the immediate removal of the economic boycott on Israel. Today, this anachronistic policy remains a stark reminder of Arab hatred toward Israel and a major obstacle to further economic development and cooperation in the region. As this Congress continues to demonstrate its support for the peace process, we should press Arab nations to remove the boycott and give the process a much needed boost.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has an important stake in seeing the development of

peace and respect for human rights in the Middle East. In the long run, formation of a CSCME process could help encourage democratic developments, diminish the threats of radical Islamic fundamentalism, stem terrorism, curb arms proliferation, and stimulate trade relations. By supporting such a process, we also support our own vital national interests and clearly demonstrate the importance we place on securing peace and security in a region badly in need of both. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this measure which demonstrates our support for peace in the Middle East.

**CONGRESS MUST TAKE ACTION ON
TAINTED BLOOD-CLOTTING FAC-
TOR**

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring the attention of this House to a tragedy that may well have been preventable.

By the mid-1980's, more than 10,000 hemophiliacs had become HIV-positive through treatment with infected blood-clotting factors. These clotting factors were used to help hemophiliacs control bleeding, as hemophiliacs suffer from internal bleeding that does not clot normally.

Yet, ironically, the clotting factors that were designed to make hemophiliacs' lives more liveable may have instead cost the lives of many hemophiliacs who are now dying of AIDS. In 1982, a manufacturer of one of the clotting factors suggested that those using the factor should be made aware of the possible risk that clotting factors could be tainted with the HIV virus. Yet doctors and other manufacturers continued to disperse the clotting factors, without warning the users of the possible risk. By 1985, 70 percent of the hemophilic population was found to be HIV-positive. As of last May, according to the New York Times, 1,709 hemophiliacs had died from AIDS.

The set of facts in this case raises a number of troubling questions. Could the infection of thousands of hemophiliacs with the HIV virus have been prevented if the risks of treatment with the clotting factor had been made public. Why were steps not taken earlier to purify the clotting factor if it was apparent that a risk existed?

I am pleased that Secretary Shalala has asked the National Academy of Sciences to investigate this matter. Yet Congress has investigative authority, and this certainly seems to be a case in which we have a mandate to investigate. I urge this House to take action on this issue.

**PROTECTIVE MILITARY
INTERVENTION IN HAITI**

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as the first year of the 103d Congress draws to a close, it is

of utmost importance to remember that the fate of democracy in Haiti is of vital interest to the United States. Congress should stand behind the President to send a bipartisan message throughout the Western Hemisphere and the world. Americans care about democracy everywhere; however, we recognize that in Haiti the reinstatement of the constitutionally elected leader, President Aristide, will solve several additional critical problems.

The return of Aristide and full democracy to Haiti means that Haiti will no longer be a major depot for cocaine on its way into the neighborhoods of America. The oppression and domination of that nation by criminals in military uniforms will cease. The second largest drug transshipment point in the hemisphere will be closed down by a government which respects the rule of law.

The return of Aristide will end the desperate flight from Haiti of people fleeing terror and genocide. The United States will be set free from its policy of unprecedented cruelty to refugees. The U.S. Coast Guard will no longer be ordered to return escapees to their persecutors. During Aristide's 7 months in office, prior to the bloody coup, the number of citizens seeking to leave Haiti went down to zero. When we return democracy to Haiti we will return decency to our own refugee policy.

Support for democracy in Haiti will also send a strong message to the rest of the world that the United States is still willing to stand up for its principles and use force if necessary. North Korea and Iraq must be given a clear warning, a highly visible example demonstrating that America will not waffle in the face of threats from shabby dictators. As a party to the Governors Island Agreement the United States must now do whatever is necessary to enforce this agreement. Protective military intervention is needed to safeguard the constitutional government in Haiti. We must provide the forces necessary, not to invade or to conquer, but to protect the legal government.

Now is not the time to waffle. Haiti has a President elected by 70 percent of the people. Haiti has a Prime Minister with a cabinet. Haiti has an elected legislative body. Haiti has a constitution approved by a vote of the people. Haiti is not Somalia. Haiti is an opportunity to express the very best of the American spirit and resolve. Without further waiting the United States must do whatever is necessary to support the majority of the people of Haiti. Democracy in Haiti is definitely a vital interest of the United States.

WIMPS WAFFLING ON HAITI

Mr. President don't waffle
Haiti yearns to breathe free
For decades of oppression
We owe Haiti this fee
Don't waffle
Like the Congress wimps
Remember you won
While the big ego boys
Waited til '96 to run
Bullies against change
Towards without compassion
Remember Mr. President
The vision resides
Not in their obsolete
Star wars skies
Vision lives clearer
Behind your fresh eyes
Mr. President, don't waffle

Haiti yearns to breathe free
Remember Lincoln
On the morning
Of the Emancipation
That President closed his ears
Only the scratch of his pen
And the slide of his tears
Were heard that hallowed day
But the drums of history
For Lincoln still beat
In the pantheon of eternity
Angels reserve his seat
In the beginning
God created everything
In 1993 one courageous act
Can give birth
To a new Haiti
Mr. President don't waffle
Like the loud heartless wimps
Remember you won
While misguided Congress sages
Waited til '96 to run

**IN HONOR OF ZACHARY AND
ELIZABETH FISHER**

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two extraordinary people, Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher. The Fishers are unparalleled American patriots whose devotion to country and to those who have sacrificed all for America is nothing short of extraordinary.

The Fishers began their dedication to the military when they saved the historic aircraft carrier *Intrepid* from the scrapheap. Twenty million dollars later, the *Intrepid* became the heart of the now famous Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Museum which also includes the destroyer *Edson*, the first missile firing submarine *Growler*, and the historic Nantucket lightship—wartime beacon in the Battle of the Atlantic. The *Intrepid* was the anchorage for five annual "Fleet Weeks" in New York/New Jersey Harbor, a homecoming for the victors of Desert Storm and part of the celebration of the 500th Anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America. It welcomed the first Russian warship in New York harbor since World War I.

The Fishers, recognizing that patriotism is hard to stimulate and sustain in peacetime, continue to demonstrate their feelings that patriotism is gratitude, that we owe our own security to the sacrifice, the readiness, the vigilance of our Armed Forces, who are always in harm's way.

Their continuing generosity to the Armed Forces has built a succession of "Fisher Houses" family "comfort homes" at military hospitals, 12 so far. Gen. Colin Powell sent them this salute for the opening of the Fisher House at the Eisenhower Medical Center, Fort Gordon, GA.

DEAR ZACH AND ELIZABETH, Alma and I are delighted to send our greetings as the Fisher House is dedicated at the Eisenhower Medical Center. And I understand plans are underway to build more. For years, you have taken the lead in a quiet and lastingly effective way to personally thank and support the Armed Forces for their labors. Whether it be college scholarships for military dependents or financial aid for families who have lost

loved ones in the line of duty, you have always been there to help ease the burden.

Nothing, however, speaks more eloquently to the compassion, generosity and commitment of Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher to our men and women in uniform and their families than the Fisher Houses. Week after week, and from coast to coast, the Fisher Houses are there to help families with medical emergencies at a time when that help is needed the most. The letters of love you receive from those family members who have stayed at a Fisher House are the greatest reward you can ever receive.

Alma and I send our love and good wishes on this special occasion. Zach and Elizabeth Fisher, you are special members of the military family.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL,
Chairman of the
Joint Chiefs of Staff.

General Powell called them "members of the military family," a kinship they treasure. They have been always keenly sensitive to critical emergency needs—too often forgotten in peacetime. Example: Their response to the tragic massacre of the Marine peace-keeping force in Beirut, followed by the U.S.S. *Stark* missile attack incidents in the Persian Gulf. Both disasters were heart breaking news to the Fishers, but out of their sorrow emerged the Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher Armed Services Foundation, pledged to help service men and women and their families in specific times of need.

Never was the need more apparent than after the 1989 turret explosion aboard the U.S.S. *Iowa*. Just a year earlier, the battleship had visited New York during Fleet Week. The Fishers had been aboard the *Iowa* and had met some of the crewmen who were later killed. The battleship had saved the *Intrepid* from being sunk during a massive kamikaze attack 44 years earlier in World War II.

The scores of crewmen killed aboard the *Iowa* were a very personal loss to the Fishers. Each of the 47 families received a \$25,000 check and letter explaining that while nothing could compensate for the loss of their loved ones, it was hoped that they could take some comfort in knowing that "two total strangers cared enough about the family's grief to send a token of their remorse."

The Fisher Armed Services Foundation also provides scholarship funds to eligible college students, provided they either are or were in the Armed Forces or are the offspring of service members. The Fishers will be sending over 100 youths to college this coming year.

In 1990, the Fishers first devoted foundation resources to constructing and donating comfort homes for the Armed Forces. Each would be named "The Zachary and Elizabeth Fisher House" and would be located on the grounds of various military hospitals around the country. The homes would be capable of housing up to 16 members of families who otherwise would have no place to stay while their military father or husband was undergoing a serious operation or treatment. It was the Fishers' intention to be able to keep service families together during a medical emergency or crisis, when the service member especially needed the support and comfort of all his or her family members.

The first comfort home location chosen was the National Naval Medical Center at Be-

thesda, MD. It was officially opened on June 23, 1991, by the President and Mrs. Bush, Secretary of the Navy Garrett, and Mr. and Mrs. Fisher. At the same time the mortgage was assumed by the Fishers for the hostel at the Portsmouth Naval Hospital at Portsmouth, VA.

The second house was donated to the U.S. Army. The Chief of Staff of the Army, General Sullivan, dedicated the structure at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC, on July 25, 1991.

The Fishers have committed to build a total of 22 houses for the U.S. Armed Forces, the last scheduled to be completed by the end of 1993. The first Fisher House for the Air Force was dedicated at the Wilford Hall U.S.A.F. Medical Center at Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, TX, on April 1, 1992. On that same day they broke ground for a Fisher House at the Brooke Army Medical Center at Fort Sam Houston, also in San Antonio.

All of the buildings are of the same basic design. The Fishers construct and furnish the structures, then donate them to the respective service branches.

Each military community maintains its house through donations, appropriations or nominal charges.

The home-like setting of the Fisher Houses has proved to be outstandingly successful. Besides keeping individual families together, the common purpose of all of the resident families brings them all together to support each other during particularly critical times. The result is that families from military bases around the world make new and close friends who understand their pain and fears and help them while staying at a Fisher House.

As the honorary chairman of Fleet Week, Fisher has been involved in some very fulfilling and satisfying experiences. This annual event in New York Harbor is one of the highlights of the year for both of the Fishers and has been very successful in all aspects of the Navy and Coast Guard. What Zachary cares most about is that the visiting sailors, marines and coast guardsmen have a great time in New York before they head out to sea. He personally funds a series of events which include large crew parties aboard the *Intrepid*.

As chairman of the *Intrepid* Museum's "Year of Columbus" commemoration in 1992, the fifth annual Fleet Week was expanded into International Fleet Week. It recognized the pioneering explorations of the seven European funding father nations which led to the establishment of the United States. Several sent warships, all seven sent commemorative exhibits and representatives.

The Fishers sponsored the Age of Exploration exhibition aboard the *Intrepid* and hosted the prolonged visit of the three Columbus ships, the *Nina*, *Pinta*, and *Santa Maria*. As such, the *Intrepid* hosted the largest and most significant 500th anniversary commemoration of the discovery of the New World.

On November 12, 1992, Zachary donated the Fisher Sports Center building to the United States Coast Guard on Governors Island, in New York harbor.

Zachary Fisher's civic and patriotic contributions are both national and international: For 3 consecutive years, he served as an adviser to the U.S. delegation on the Housing Committee

of the Economic Commission for Europe conference held in Geneva, Switzerland. With his wife at his side, he became a director of Honor America, a member of the board of advisers of the Veteran's Bedside Network and a director of the Ellis Island Restoration Committee.

Most recently, Zachary and Elizabeth have created through their foundation the Chairman's Award for Military Medical Leadership. The winners, selected by the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, represent the very best in medical scholarship, research, practice, and leadership. Each winner receives a medal and a \$50,000 grant for the medical research program that he or she chooses.

Throughout his new career of service to the Armed Forces, Fisher has been recognized for his contributions by many organizations:

The then Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. James D. Watkins, bestowed the rank of honorary admiral upon him because of his outstanding service to the U.S. Navy. Not to be outdone by the Navy, the then Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Alfred Gray, gave him the honorary rank of sergeant major.

Saint Michael's College, Norwich University, and the Massachusetts Maritime Academy have all recognized Fisher by awarding him honorary doctorate degrees.

He was the first civilian to receive the Navy League's SEC-NAV Award for having excelled in the cause of national defense.

The Coast Guard has presented Mr. Fisher with both the Distinguished Public Service Award and the Meritorious Public Service Award.

On May 1, 1989, he received the Department of the Navy's Distinguished Public Service Award from the Secretary of the Navy for his support of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

On May 5, 1989, the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff presented him with the Department of Defense's Distinguished Public Service Award for his contributions and service to the Armed Forces.

On September 1, 1989, the Government of Poland awarded him their highest civilian decoration, the Order of Merit, for the commemorative special exhibit at the *Intrepid* about the 50th anniversary of the beginning of World War II.

On April 5, 1990, Countess Maria Fede Caproni and the Italian Government presented him with the Cenquattennale Record Mondiale D'ultezza for his efforts to promote better Italian-United States relations.

On May 18, 1990, he was inducted into the select ranks of the members of the Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans.

On June 12, 1990, New York City Schools' Chancellor Joseph Fernandez saluted Zachary for furthering education in space exploration and for promoting international understanding.

In October 1990, the Association of the United States Army presented the Fishers with the Statue of Liberty Award in appreciation of their outstanding patriotism and support of those who serve in the Armed Forces.

On October 7, 1991, the Secretary of the Army, Michael Stone, landed aboard the *Intrepid* and presented both of the Fishers with the Decoration for Distinguished Civilian Service and the Order of Medical Merit.

On February 7, 1992, Mr. and Mrs. Fisher received the highest award presented by the Catholic Youth Organization [CYO], the Champions Gold Medal Award for their commitment to military families and young people.

On February 12, 1992, the American Legion recognized the Fishers for their dedication of American's military personnel and for the Fisher House on military installations by awarding them the 1992 Commander's Award.

On March 14, 1992, Zachary received a special award from the Navy Medical Corps at the Uniformed Service University of the Health Sciences at the Naval Medical Center.

On June 30, 1992, Mr. Fisher was guest of honor and recipient of the Semper Fidelis Award from the Marine Corps Scholarship Foundation in Washington, DC.

September 18, 1992, was proclaimed as Zachary Fisher Day in the tidewater area cities of Virginia Beach, Newport News, and Portsmouth, VA. in recognition of his support of the Armed Forces.

Zachary Fisher's devotion to his country is best summed up in the inscription on the prestigious President's Plaque presented to him by President Reagan. It stated: "To the tireless, dedicated work of many Americans, the *Intrepid* will serve as an inspiration. One man deserves special tribute—Zachary Fisher, a patriotic American who never forgot and cares so much."

The flag rank, the title that best characterize Zachary and his Elizabeth, is the salute from sailors and soldiers to, "The Admirable Fishers."

WYOMING YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK 125TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATE COIN ACT

HON. CRAIG THOMAS

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are rightfully proud of their system of national parks. The crown jewel of that system is situated mostly within my home State of Wyoming. I'm speaking, of course, of Yellowstone National Park.

On March 1, 1872, Yellowstone became America's first national park, and with an area of over 3,400 square miles it is to this day our largest. Literally millions of Americans have visited this national treasure, sharing with their families the wonder of the world-famous geyser basins, hot springs, and mud pots. Rivers, lakes, canyons, waterfalls, and a vast selection of viewable wildlife—found in their natural environment—add to the mystique of Yellowstone.

There's another side to Yellowstone, as well. As visitation has increased, the wear and tear on the over 500 miles of roads, 1,000 miles of trails, and countless public facilities has taken its toll. Despite increases in funding, the National Park Service has been unable to keep pace. Congress has, at times, made things worse by adding more land and responsibilities to the national system without addressing the needs of our existing parks.

It is this backlog of maintenance needs, coupled with the proud history of our first na-

tional park, which has led me to introduce today the Yellowstone National Park 125 Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act.

This bill will direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins to commemorate the 125th anniversary of Yellowstone National Park, which will fall on March 1, 1997. This bill is budget neutral and, in fact, will help reduce the national debt.

The surcharges from the sale of the coins will be divided three ways—25 percent will be paid to the Secretary of the Interior to be used for Yellowstone National Park, 25 percent will be paid to the Secretary of the Interior for use by the National Park Service, and 50 percent will be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury for the sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

This is a commonsense approach which allows everyone to win. There isn't a down side to this bill—we can reduce the national debt, give needed additional resources to Yellowstone National Park and the National Park Service, and we can properly honor our oldest national park. I invite all my colleagues to join me in this effort.

NAFTA

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the following articles underscore the importance of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, not only to my home State of Texas, but to the Nation as a whole. NAFTA brings unprecedented opportunity to America and American workers, providing an export market eager for American products and services. Its vision is of the future, a future of free and open global markets, a future where America retains its stature as the world's only superpower. I hope that each Member will take the time to read these articles, and I urge them to vote for this historic agreement.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Sept. 15, 1993]

SOLID FRAMEWORK

NAFTA OBJECTIONS DO NOT SQUARE WITH THE FACTS

President Bill Clinton has bent over backward to accommodate environmental and organized labor objections to the North American Free Trade Agreement. Concessions to labor and environmentalists by Clinton are the sum and substance of the so-called "side agreements" signed by the President in a White House ceremony Tuesday.

With the signing of the side agreements there is no good reason for ratification of NAFTA to be held up by Congress. Opposition to NAFTA based on environmental or labor concerns is disingenuous. It simply does not stand under factual examination.

Environmentalists who persist in an all-or-nothing position on NAFTA ignore the fact that pollution along the U.S.-Mexico border has been a growing problem since long before the free-trade agreement was developed. The side agreements provide a solid framework for beginning to deal with such issues.

Hard-liners also overlook the point that environmental responsibility is an expensive proposition, one which thriving economies

are best able to afford. Helping Mexico improve its economy is a sure way to encourage environmental improvement. The economic growth derived from NAFTA will give Mexico the resources to beef up its enforcement. This promises not only to help our border environment, but also to give U.S. companies who lead the world in environmental technology the opportunity to provide many of the goods and services needed for these purposes.

With regard to jobs, the Congressional Budget Office has reported that in the short run, U.S. employment would increase by between 5,000 and 170,000 jobs. Although there are likely to be some job losses as companies relocate in Mexico, most studies suggest that these will amount to less than 200,000 over a decade.

The CBO has said: "Even if the number of workers displaced because of NAFTA were twice the high end of the range of job losses . . . that would still be less than 400,000 job losses in any economy with nearly 120 million jobs." It is worth noting that, in normal times total U.S. employment grows at more than four times this figure annually.

The facts speak for themselves. They argue persuasively for ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

[From The Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1993]

WHAT NAFTA WON'T DO

As people think about NAFTA, President Clinton recently observed, they will see that an important part of the argument has been reversed. Opponents attribute to this future agreement many dangers that actually are part of the present situation—which the agreement is, in reality, designed to remedy. Mr. Clinton was probably thinking of the squalid working conditions and the environmental pollution that can be found along the Mexican border. It wasn't the North American Free Trade Agreement that created them. They already exist. The agreement, by requiring better enforcement of environmental laws, would be a powerful force for improvement.

Some of the environmental advocacy organizations sound as though they thought the defeat of NAFTA would somehow roll back industrialization in Mexico and return the country to a pristine pre-industrial state. Hardly. What in fact would happen is further rapid industrial development with none of the rules and constraints that the agreement provides.

Mr. Clinton made that comment as he went into a persuasion session on NAFTA with a dozen congressmen. He apparently wasn't entirely successful. One, John Conyers (D-Mich.), came out saying, "I still believe it's a job loser." Much of the opposition to the agreement arises from the fears that American factories will go south to seek low-wage labor. Coming from Detroit, Mr. Conyers is particularly sensitive to the anxieties of automobile workers.

He might want to consider the two major German automobile manufacturers that have chosen to locate new plants in the United States rather than in Mexico. BMW is putting a large assembly operation into South Carolina, and Mercedes-Benz has just announced that it will build in Alabama. Mr. Conyers would doubtless prefer that they had gone to Michigan, but BMW says that within a couple of years its wages will be up to Detroit levels. It's not that wages are irrelevant to these companies. One of their reasons for coming to the United States is that industrial compensation—wages plus fringe benefits—is 60 percent higher in Germany than here. By northern European

standards, the United States is a low-wage country.

But why didn't the Germans go to Mexico for still lower wages? The answer is evidently the quality of labor here, the access to suppliers and the reliability of the transportation system. If that logic brings the makers of German cars to this country, why wouldn't the same logic keep Ford, Chrysler and General Motors plants here?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1993]

MESSAGE FROM MEXICO

Mexico's President Carlos Salinas de Gortari was absolutely right to tell the U.S. Congress that if it fails to vote on NAFTA before the end of the year, the deal's off. The two countries have pledged to put NAFTA—the North American Free Trade Agreement—into effect on Jan. 1. There's no reason for further delay. The people in Congress who want to postpone the vote are the ones that want to kill the whole agreement.

President Clinton has never favored delay. Two weeks ago, calling the agreement "a good deal for the United States," he wrote to the congressional leaders urging enactment promptly before the end of this year's session.

Why President Salinas's firm and explicit public statement now? You can discern two purposes—one addressed to American politicians, the other to Mexicans.

Here in Washington most of the loudest opposition to NAFTA is coming from Democrats. Some of them, uneasy about opposing their own president on a major vote, are trying hard to float the idea that if they succeed in defeating the agreement, he can sit down later and work out a more favorable version. That's a fantasy. Mr. Salinas wants to ensure that nobody misunderstands the realities. The present agreement is the kind of opportunity, he said, that "only presents itself once in a generation." If the United States refuses it, they won't be another chance for a long, long time.

As for his Mexican audience—1994 is an election year there as well as here—Mr. Salinas is already under attack from the nationalists for having given the Americans too much. The deal offers more to American exporters than to Mexicans. The reason is that the border is, with minor exceptions, already open to goods moving northward. It's Mexico that's now in the process of opening long-closed markets. Mr. Salinas isn't doing it to please Americans. He's doing it for Mexico, whose economy is already responding with strong growth and rising incomes. But he's in no mood to offer more concessions. Instead, he's saying: Take it or leave it—but if you leave it, we'll give Japanese and European exporters and investors the benefits first offered you.

Any congressman who wants to refuse would be wise first to talk to this Democratic administration's economists. They will point out that increasing exports are now Americans' best hope for more and better jobs.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25, 1993]

WHY TRADE MATTERS

One way or the other, for better or much worse, American policy on foreign trade is likely to be changed dramatically before the end of this year. Three major negotiations and agreements are moving toward deadlines in the next couple of months. Since they involve somewhat different constituencies, they are commonly discussed one at a time. But the connections are crucial.

President Clinton's trade negotiator, Mickey Kantor, threatened Japan the other day with sanctions if there's no agreement by Nov. 1 in a quarrel over foreign companies' access to Japanese construction work. Why the unilateral deadline? Perhaps Mr. Kantor wishes to demonstrate this administration's firmness at a time when Congress is moving toward a vote on the North American Free Trade Agreement. NAFTA, which involves only the three countries on this continent, is entirely distinct from the Uruguay Round of negotiations, a massively complex attempt to rewrite and modernize the worldwide rules of trade. More than 100 countries are taking part in it, but at present it's hung up on a vehement dispute between the United States and the European Community, particularly France, over farm subsidies.

The deadline in the Japanese talks comes in hardly more than a week. A deeply divided House of Representatives is to vote on NAFTA in mid-November. If the Uruguay Round doesn't produce a general agreement by Dec. 15, the whole effort will collapse. C. Fred Bergsten of the Institute for International Economics points out the ugly possibility that all of these processes could go sour, with the effects of each disaster compounding the next. The U.S.-Japan talks seem to be headed toward tit-for-tat retaliation, the House could well defeat NAFTA, and the farm subsidy dispute may torpedo the whole Uruguay Round. Such a series of breakdowns in the trading system could tip the world—as Mr. Bergsten observes—into a severe recession.

It's not clear that the governments of the world's half-dozen dominant countries have the political will to rescue themselves. Perhaps over these next two crucial months they will merely cave in to their clamorous special interests—Japanese construction contractors, American labor leaders, French farmers. Yet each of these governments knows that widening access to foreign markets has been a crucial element in the economic magic that, over the past four decades, has doubled incomes here in the United States, tripled them in Western Europe and sextupled them in Japan. The question is whether the industrial democracies, becoming rich, have now begun to grow careless and drift away from the discipline that brought them their unprecedented wealth.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1993]

WHY VOTE FOR NAFTA?

So why should a congressman vote for NAFTA? The Mexican economy is one-twentieth the size of this country's, and neither President Clinton nor any other supporters promise any large immediate benefits. The opposition is vociferous. As Mr. Clinton said yesterday, several large unions have chosen NAFTA as the receptacle into which to pour "all the resentments and fears and insecurities" of the recent years with their stagnant wages and plant closings. Why go to the trouble and risk of voting for it?

If you think that jobs in manufacturing are important, you'd better back NAFTA. Mr. Clinton pointed out that, as in farming, productivity in manufacturing has been rising rapidly. A steadily declining work force can produce as much as this country needs or will buy. To create and retain additional manufacturing jobs is going to require access to foreign markets, guaranteed by trade agreements like this one that would tie the three countries of North America more closely together. If it fails, there will be a real danger that the whole process of trade expansion, pressed slowly forward ever since

World War II, falls into retreat with dire effects on wages and employment in all the rich countries.

Many congressmen are deeply interested in labor standards and deplore the poor conditions along the Mexican border. Defeating NAFTA won't improve those conditions. But enacting it can make a difference. Similarly, congressmen with an interest in the environment need to remember that there are substantial environmental protections in the agreement. Voting against it won't reduce the toxic pollution in the border areas. But NAFTA can. NAFTA is the first trade agreement to address labor standards and environmental quality and—if it goes into effect—will establish an important precedent for action. Congressmen who genuinely want to see improvements are going to have to vote for the agreement. It's the instrument for change.

The greatest gains in American employment will come, Mr. Clinton argues, when NAFTA is extended to other Latin countries in the years ahead. He sees it—correctly—as an enormous opportunity, like the European Community, not only to promote economic prosperity but democracy, freedom and political stability.

In this century these values have traveled in close association with open trade, and when one has been in retreat the others have also been in jeopardy. No one originally intended it to turn out this way, but the battle over a regional trade agreement has now reached a pitch at which it has become a fundamental vote on American hopes and goals as the world's strongest leader.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD O. BUCKBEE

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Edward O. Buckbee, who has announced his retirement as Director of the U.S. Space and Rocket Center in Huntsville, AL.

Mr. Buckbee has devoted his life to the advancement and enrichment of our Nation's space program. His tireless efforts for the U.S. Space and Rocket Center have attracted millions of visitors from all over the world. He is one of our community's most dedicated ambassadors, helping build an international reputation of excellence for north Alabama.

Mr. Buckbee served as a NASA public relations specialist at the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville from 1961 to 1968. Buckbee joined Dr. Wehrner von Braun in his quest to establish a public program for space science education. Their labors were realized in 1965 with the establishment of the Space and Rocket Center, now known as the U.S. Space and Rocket Center. The Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission appointed Buckbee director of the center in 1968.

The U.S. Space and Rocket Center has expanded dramatically since opening to the public in 1970. The hands-on space science museum boasts the world's largest rocket and spacecraft collection. Highlights of the Space Center include U.S. Space Camp, U.S. Space Academy, Aviation Challenge, Rocket Park, Shuttle Park, the NASA Visitor Center and bus

tour, the Spacedome Theater, and numerous expansion and enhancement projects.

Inspired by Dr. von Braun, Mr. Buckbee envisioned the Space Center as the birthplace of a new kind of learning experience for young people. The program would offer students keener insight into the U.S. Space Program, and it would serve as a catalyst for the study of math and science curricula. In 1982 Buckbee's vision became reality as the Space Center played host to 747 young trainees during the inaugural season of U.S. Space Camp. Over the last decade, the U.S. Space Camp has experienced phenomenal growth, graduating over 170,000 people.

To meet the overwhelming public demand for this unique space science orientation, Mr. Buckbee coordinated the creation of four new educational programs. U.S. Space Academy opened in 1984 and academy level II was established in 1987. U.S. Space Academy for Educators opened in 1987 for elementary and middle school teachers of math and science. Aviation Challenge began in 1990, offering jet-pilot-style training to middle school and high school students, as well as adults. Buckbee met another public request in 1991 with the creation of parent-child sessions.

Recognizing the widespread interest in U.S. Space Camp programs, Mr. Buckbee organized the formation of the U.S. Space Camp Foundation in 1987. This action permitted the operation of space camps outside Alabama. In 1988 the U.S. Space Camp opened a sister campus in Titusville, FL, near NASA's Kennedy Space Center. As executive director of the foundation, Buckbee oversees the operation of the Florida, campus. He also acts as liaison with the Florida project partner, the Mercury Seven Foundation, headed by America's first astronaut, Alan Shepard.

In 1988 the United States Space Camp Foundation granted a licensing agreement to Nippon Steel to build Space Camp Japan. The operation opened in 1990. Euro Space Camp opened in 1991 near Brussels, Belgium. Agreements have been signed for upcoming Space Camp operations in Canada and Italy.

To promote international cooperation in space, Mr. Buckbee has participated in numerous efforts aimed at joining American Space Camp trainees with their counterparts in Europe, Russia, Japan, and Canada. International Space Camp was initiated in 1990 with participation in Huntsville by students and teachers from 20 countries. In 1993 International Space played host to 25 countries and 40 of America's teachers of the year.

Among Mr. Buckbee's many honors are the National Institute of Public Affairs Fellowship by NASA, the Yuri Gagarin Cosmonaut Medal from the Soviet Union, and the NASA Distinguished Public Service Medal. He is the recipient of the Jimmy Doolittle Fellow, awarded by the Aerospace Education Foundation of the Air Force Association. Buckbee has also received the Army's Decoration for Distinguished Civilian Service.

I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Buckbee on my own behalf and on behalf of my district coordinator, Lynne Berry Lowery, who currently serves as a member of the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission.

It is an honor to recognize Mr. Buckbee for his distinguished contributions to the U.S.

Space Program and north Alabama. I congratulate him on his profound accomplishments and I wish him the very best in his upcoming retirement. Although his presence will be sorely missed, Ed Buckbee will leave behind a legacy of achievement that will fascinate and inspire countless future generations.

NAFTA

HON. ERIC FINGERHUT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric over NAFTA has reached a fever pitch in these last few days, but I am frustrated that the debate has degenerated into such "he said-she said" arguments that no one has focused on what an alternative trade policy might look like.

Let me clearly state—I oppose NAFTA and will vote against it. Unlike others who argue against the treaty, though, I believe this must be the beginning—not the end—of our national debate regarding free trade and the future of our businesses and workers.

Over the years, we have lost thousands of manufacturing jobs to Southeast Asia, Mexico, and other low-wage economies. NAFTA would only make that trend worse. No matter what the supporters say, we will lose jobs under NAFTA—especially the good manufacturing jobs that are critical to the Greater Cleveland economy.

But NAFTA's defeat will not make our trade problems go away. We will continue to lose jobs abroad until we design an aggressive export strategy and encourage our businesses to stay home and invest here. That is the positive alternative to NAFTA that has to be raised now, in the final stages of the NAFTA debate, and that is the alternative we must put into place in the future.

The heart of any trade policy should be its emphasis on increasing our export of goods. Increased exports mean economic growth, more jobs, higher wages and a better standard of living. But while the United States has traditionally pursued this goal solely through a strategy of low tariffs, other major industrial countries have used aggressive export promotion programs to penetrate our markets and clearly defined industrial policies to protect their own.

How can we be smarter and more aggressive? Last November, I proposed the creation of a Department of International Trade to coordinate our efforts and offer one-stop Federal assistance to export companies. Currently, 19 different agencies oversee 100 different trade promotion programs, an alphabet of assistance that puzzles the shrewdest business owner.

We must also reexamine what products we support with our trade promotion dollar. Agriculture products, for example, amount to only 10 percent of our total exports, yet they get 74 percent of our trade promotion funding.

Government can also help boost exports by getting out of the way when it is hurting private trade efforts. Export controls leftover from

the cold war, for example, cost us an estimated \$10 to \$20 billion a year in lost trade.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee panel on trade, I am helping to craft an export promotion strategy that would go a long way toward helping American businesses penetrate other markets. The plan we are devising would make our trade promotion programs more user-friendly for businesses and would target the markets where American goods have the most chance of finding buyers. Also, it would clear the thicket of antiquated export controls that are an albatross around the neck of American exporters.

To complement such aggressive trade promotion efforts, we must also develop an industrial policy to help U.S. companies who compete with foreign countries. Such an industrial policy would include support for manufacturers who are producing break-through export goods. The Northeast-Midwest Coalition's Manufacturing Task Force in Congress is designing such support in the form of a package of tax incentives. I am a member of the task force, and I have invited the group to the 19th District to hold hearings in the near future. We plan to announce a legislative program by the beginning of the year, and then work on a bipartisan basis to have it enacted.

The budget approved in August included a good start in providing incentives to manufacturers by cutting the capital gains tax for long-term investments in many small businesses. Why not expand that cut to apply to long-term investments in all domestic manufacturing? And why not allow investors to roll over capital gains into these new investments without paying new taxes? We do the same thing for people who sell and buy homes within a year. That way we encourage job growth and job retention in industries here at home—rather than export our jobs abroad.

Under such an aggressive trade and industrial policy, Ohio and the 19th Congressional District that I represent would fare well. Recently, I held an official hearing of the House Space Subcommittee in my district to discuss technology transfer between NASA Lewis and local small businesses. The Federal officials who participated were impressed at the high-tech talent in this area and the Federal/private sector technology sharing already taking place. Also, in the award-winning Great Lakes Technology Center and the Cleveland Advanced Manufacturing Program, the Greater Cleveland area has the framework in place to capitalize on a new, post-NAFTA, export-related industrial policy.

Contrary to what you may hear over the next few days, there is not only life after NAFTA, but our industries can again become the leaders in innovative and technology-based exports. For Ohio, a future without NAFTA seems particularly bright.

NAFTA TAX CUT

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, NAFTA's critics are whipping up yet another flimsy argument against passage of the agreement.

They charge that passage of NAFTA will somehow erode American sovereignty. They point to the international commissions created to mitigate labor and environmental disputes among the three countries.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has studied this agreement will recognize this as a transparent appeal to fear.

Under NAFTA, no international body has any legal authority over American domestic affairs. Furthermore, NAFTA does not allow any private individual or party to bring suit against a sovereign nation.

The bottom line is that sovereignty means autonomy. Is the United States able to export its goods to Mexico without artificial obstructions such as tariffs? Not currently.

However, with passage of NAFTA our economic autonomy will be strengthened by the elimination of barriers to trade and investment in Mexico.

The United States will regain the power to make its economic decisions based upon the freedom to trade with Mexico. It will no longer be forced to play by somebody else's economic rules. When we have an even playing field on which to compete, America is virtually unbeatable. This is what NAFTA will provide, thus giving America more economic sovereignty.

This brings us to American's tax sovereignty. Americans pay too many taxes. That is why I support NAFTA. The centerpiece of NAFTA will amount to a \$1.8 billion tax cut for American consumers over the next 5 years.

When two Americans trade goods on the marketplace, the Government takes a cut—this is a tax. But, when an American and a Mexican trade goods in the marketplace, the Governments of both countries tax us twice. Not only is the product slapped with a tax in the production process, but it's taxed again at the border in the form of a tariff. What's even worse, American products are taxed at 2½ times the rate of Mexican goods.

When taxes are raised or lowered, economic activity responds accordingly. When taxes are low, the market is more active since buyers and sellers exchange more goods. The same principle applies for tariffs. When tariffs drop, international economic activity increases since buyers and sellers find it makes sense to trade more goods.

Not only do lower tariffs mean we can trade more goods, we can trade more types of goods. A product that was not tradeable at a high tariff because of the marginal rate of return, may suddenly be able to enter the market because the after-tax return becomes profitable.

On the average, American consumers pay a 4-percent tax on goods that come into our country from Mexico. NAFTA would eliminate that tax. Anyone who votes against NAFTA is voting against a tax cut for consumers in this country.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT SETH KELLEY

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a distinguished young man from Rhode Island who has attained the rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. He is Robert Seth Kelley of Troop 42 in Hope, RI, and he is honored this week for his noteworthy achievement.

Not every young American who joins the Boy Scouts earns the prestigious Eagle Scout Award. In fact, only 2.5 percent of all Boy Scouts do. To earn the award, a Boy Scout must fulfill requirements in the areas of leadership, service, and outdoor skills. He must earn 21 merit badges, 11 of which are required from areas such as citizenship in the community, citizenship in the Nation, citizenship in the world, safety, environmental science, and first aid.

As he progresses through the Boy Scout ranks, a Scout must demonstrate participation in increasingly more responsible service projects. He must also demonstrate leadership skills by holding one or more specific youth leadership positions in his patrol and/or troop. This young man has distinguished himself in accordance with these criteria.

For his Eagle Scout project, Robert organized and supervised extensive cleaning of the exterior and surrounding area of the West Warwick Post Office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in saluting Eagle Scout Robert Seth Kelley. In turn, we must duly recognize the Boy Scouts of America for establishing the Eagle Scout Award and the strenuous criteria its aspirants must meet. This program has through its 80 years honed and enhanced the leadership skills and commitment to public service of many outstanding Americans, two dozen of whom now serve in the House.

It is my sincere belief that Robert Seth Kelley will continue his public service and in so doing will further distinguish himself and consequently better his community. I join friends, colleagues, and family who this week salute him.

RECOGNIZE LESBIAN, GAY, AND BISEXUAL RIGHTS IN THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the inclusion of protections for the human rights of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. I would also like to recognize the work of Stonewall 25, a group that has formed to organize a march and rally at the United Nations to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall Rebellion,

and to call for recognition of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

While we have certainly begun to make strides toward the recognition of the rights of lesbians and gay men in this country, we still have a long way to go. Although it has been 25 years since the Stonewall Rebellion in Greenwich Village, in which lesbians and gay men asserted their rights publicly at a time when such assertions were rare, we still have not established in law the rights of lesbians and gay men.

The Civil Rights Act of 1993, of which I am an original cosponsor, still languishes in committee, and there is little chance that it will be brought to a vote this year. Lesbians and gay men cannot divulge their sexual orientation openly if they want to serve in the armed services. And lesbians and gay men still must live in fear that they may be assaulted, hurt, or killed at any time simply because of who they are.

While we, as a nation, have made progress, we have a long way to go. We have always been proud of our tradition of tolerance. Yet, if we do not act soon to codify the rights of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, our faithfulness to our tradition of tolerance will be put to a test. The international community is being asked to add lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals to the list of those protected by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Let us not be left behind as a nation while the rest of the world makes progress in the fight for equal rights for all people.

TOUGH TALK ISN'T ENOUGH IN DRUG WAR

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the following article by our colleague BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the attention of the House. The gentleman's insights are food for thought for drug-control policymakers.

[From Long Island Newsday, Nov. 10, 1993]

TOUGH TALK ISN'T ENOUGH IN WAR ON DRUGS
(By Benjamin A. Gilman)

If the Cali and Medellin drug cartels were listed on the New York Stock Exchange, Wall Street would be issuing a strong "buy" signal for them after reading the new strategy paper released by Lee Brown, director of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Nine months after taking office, Bill Clinton's administration has labored mightily and given birth to a mouse of a statement that roars on rhetoric but squeaks on substance.

Instead of a coherent, forceful plan to attack a scourge that is devastating our cities, the American people have been handed a litany of platitudes and high-minded remarks. Regrettably, beautifully crafted phrases cannot make up for crippling budget cuts the administration has permitted in drug enforcement and interdiction programs that are vital in our efforts to defeat the cartels that prey upon our people.

The new interim strategy speaks of focusing on rehabilitation and the treatment of hard-core users at the expense of eradication, interdiction and enforcement. It ignores the relationship between drug availability and use. The administration fails to say just what new resources will be put behind this new focus.

It is another signal that, behind a screen of strong rhetoric, the president is shedding the initiatives launched under the Ronald Reagan and George Bush administrations just as they seemed to be bearing fruit. The record shows:

At the same time that he appointed Brown to his post with great fanfare and promoted the former New York City police commissioner to cabinet rank, the president quietly slashed the budget and staff of the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy by 80 percent.

The president has declared strong support for international drug efforts, stating that "where we have governments with leaders who are willing to put their lives on the line . . . we ought to be supporting them, and I expect to do that."

But, when the House moved to cut by 32 percent the principal U.S. program aimed at wiping out cocaine production in Colombia, Peru and Bolivia, the White House did nothing to stop it.

Between 1987 and 1991, 552 metric tons of cocaine were seized in Latin America alone. At the same time, the percentage of cocaine users in the United States dropped by more than half.

If interdiction and enforcement is allowed to lag, the result inevitably will be more and cheaper drugs on the streets. This will undercut the very treatment programs on which the administration wants to focus because today's casual user is tomorrow's hard-core abuser. It is like allowing plenty of candy in a house full of kids and expecting the dentist to ward off any new cavities. Winning the war on drugs requires effective, simultaneous action against both supply and demand.

Failing to maintain effective anti-narcotics operations overseas will signal that our nation has lost the will to carry the battle against illegal drugs to their source.

Lee Brown, a founder of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, is well known in his profession, but more than a high-profile White House appointment is needed; there must be a coherent anti-drug policy and adequate resources to implement it.

To be effective, that policy must go beyond the treatment of hard-core users and abusers to stopping the pushers and the producers. The president's new policy is like a beautiful new car without an engine under the hood or gas in the tank. It will take us nowhere, and the crime and health-related costs of drugs will continue to mount.

UNITED NATIONS MUST OPEN ITS DOORS TO TAIWAN

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention this guest editorial written by a constituent of mine, Prof. Thomas J. Bellows of the University of Texas at San Antonio. His article in support of

admitting Taiwan to the United Nations was published on October 17, 1993, in my hometown newspaper, the San Antonio Express-News.

IT'S TIME FOR U.N. TO OPEN DOORS TO TAIWAN

(By Thomas J. Bellows)

Seven Central American countries, all of whom recognize the Republic of China on Taiwan, have sent a joint letter to the United Nations Secretary General urging that Taiwan be added to the roster of 184 countries that are U.N. members. The People's Republic of China vigorously opposed this proposal in an August White Paper, forcefully asserting that, since both Taipei and Beijing acknowledge but one China, having two entities represent different parts of China in the United Nations is unacceptable.

Political realism suggests that an entity of 21 million people, a major exporter and importer of goods, with foreign reserves nearing \$100 billion (the highest in the world) and a per-person income higher than that of Greece, Ireland, Saudi Arabia or Portugal should not be excluded. The reality is also that Beijing will veto Taiwan's bid for admission.

The obvious and immediate solution is to approve Taiwan's becoming a permanent non-member state. This requires only the approval of the General Assembly and does not involve a Security Council vote or the probability of Peoples Republic veto. This designation routinely allows members to speak at all meetings (by invitation that is always extended) and to participate fully and extensively in informal discussions. Historically, permanent non-member states are assessed percentage contributions to the U.N. activities in which they participate.

There is an institutional history of divided nations represented by two governments invited as permanent non-member states, prior to full admission. East and West Germany and North and South Korea are examples that became full members in a few years. Other countries, such as Austria and Italy, were permanent non-member states before the Soviet Union agreed not to veto their membership applications, and they were admitted to full membership. Permanent non-member organizations have included such disparate groups as the Organization of American States, the Palestine Liberation Organization, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Vietnam (in 1974), and the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee. General Assembly votes on all permanent non-member representation since 1948 have inevitably garnered minimally a two-thirds affirmative vote. Taiwan is a formidable global economic presence. How can it be isolated from the premier comprehensive international organization dedicated to world peace and economic development?

The slogan of Chinese communism today is "to get rich is glorious." As part of the pathway to glory, private Taiwanese citizens have been permitted to invest nearly \$10 billion on the mainland. The functional dynamics of growing trade and visits and unofficial talks between the mainland and Taiwan offers a realistic hope of future, official political talks. What better place for quiet dialogue than a secluded room at the United Nations, but only if Taiwan can at least be associated with the United Nations as a permanent non-member state?

The U.S. administration quietly bemoans the mucking up of U.S.-China relations. Official administration press guidance is based on three earlier joint U.S.-China commu-

niques and the fact that both Beijing and Taipei acknowledge there is only one China. Consequently, there is no place for Taiwan at the United Nations. It is forgotten that in 1968 at the height of the Cold War, when the United States still recognized the Republic of China as the only China, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur Goldberg, proposed that People's Republic should be admitted to the United Nations while Taiwan retained its seat.

This is an opportunity for the United States, not an irritating distraction. The viability and global importance of Taiwan will not go away through an international variation of tribal shunning. The need for status, and a sense of self-respect and self-worth are as present in countries as in individuals. International second class or non-status is a growing concern to all those on Taiwan, whether pro-government or sympathetic to the opposition. All political groups on Taiwan support Taipei's desire for U.N. membership. Shunning Taiwan will inevitably lead to more numerous, strident calls for a formal declaration of independence. The People's Republic threatens force if independence is proclaimed. The seeds of a first-class international crisis will be nurtured unless the United Nations makes some positive response to Taipei.

The stairway to political reconciliation and closer linkages between Taiwan and the mainland must be taken a step at a time. Taiwan's affiliation with the United Nations will as a permanent non-member state be a major positive step. The Clinton administration's benign neutrality on the issue would contribute more to world harmony and prosperity than the current, quiet U.S. opposition to Taiwan's desire for U.N. affiliation.

THE NEED FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, if there is one issue that most Americans can agree upon today it is that something must be done soon to comprehensively reform the U.S. health care system. In the face of mounting rhetoric beginning to cloud the facts on this pressing issue, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues some of the genuine concerns my constituents have repeatedly expressed.

A short while ago, my office conducted a representative survey of nearly 5,000 residents of Illinois' Seventh Congressional District, asking them their opinions about health care administration and delivery in the United States. An astounding 4 out of 5 of those surveyed said they feel that there are problems inherent in this country's health care network and that fundamental changes are needed.

Almost 76 percent of those questioned said that, over the past 5 years, their out-of-pocket expenses for health care have increased. The irony of this situation is that at the same time that these expenses have increased for Seventh District residents, health insurance benefits for those lucky enough to have them seem to be stagnating, Mr. Speaker.

Two out of three individuals responding stated that their benefits have either remained unchanged or have decreased in the last 5

years. Also, close to half of all respondents believe it is harder to apply for and receive payment for health insurance claims from their health insurance provider.

The combination of rising costs and significant cutbacks in benefits are a signal to many that the Government must play a strong role in reforming America's health care system. An overwhelming 85 percent of my constituents surveyed answered with a resounding "yes" when asked whether the Federal Government should have a role in containing the mounting cost of health care.

Mr. Speaker, the views of my constituents echo the need for Congress to work swiftly and effectively toward comprehensive health care reform. It is clear that the current system continues to degenerate every day, with increasing costs and additional individuals and families who are denied coverage. We must remember to listen to the American people at every step of the health care reform process and not allow special interests to obfuscate the facts in this debate.

There has got to be a better way Mr. Speaker—a better way to provide health care to all Americans than the way it is done today—or, for 37 million uninsured Americans, not done.

TRIBUTE TO GARY HART

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Gary Hart, one of my closest friends. I treasured working with Gary in the assembly: His passionate commitment to the environment, education, and civil rights along with his basic goodness and sense of fair play defined him as someone special. I was indeed fortunate to meet him at the outset of my career.

It is not for nothing that Gary is one of the best-known and admired politicians in California. He is a creative thinker and a tireless worker; two attributes that are invaluable in the world of politics. Gary is a man of action, and not mere words. His reputation rests on his accomplishments. He is also one of those rare elected representatives who is more than willing to take risks.

An example is Senate bill 813, one of the few pieces of legislation that is known by its number. S. 813, passed during Gary's first term in the Senate in 1983, improved school funding and strengthened academic standards. It is one of the few bits of good news that public education received in California during the past few years. Imagine how much worse shape the schools would be in today if Gary had not fought hard for passage of S. 813.

Gary's education agenda also included legislation requiring statewide, performance-based testing of students and efforts to reduce the cost of higher education. In addition, he was the author of a bill that created charter schools.

Gary is as good on the environment as he is on education. In 1989, he sponsored a bill

that enabled California consumers to receive a nickel for every two cans they recycle, and a nickel for each of the large two-liter soft drink containers. He also fought for tougher controls on the handling and transportation of toxic materials.

Finally, Gary has, in recent years, made the fight against AIDS one of his top priorities. He helped pass legislation mandating AIDS education in junior and senior high schools. In recognition of his efforts, Stop Aids Now has named Gary as the recipient of its first community service award.

I have indeed been privileged to have maintained a close personal and professional relationship with Gary for nearly two decades. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Gary Hart, who brings his own profound sense of dignity and purpose to politics.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION OF 1992 IN OHIO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I submit, for the RECORD, a paper written by Philip A. Grant, a professor of history at Pace University in New York City. The paper, entitled "The Presidential Election of 1992 in Ohio," offers insight into the political landscape of my home State. I believe every American can learn from Professor Grant's work because Ohio has long been one of the Nation's political bellwethers.

I commend the professor and I commend Dr. William Binning, a Professor at Youngstown State University in my 17th Congressional District, for their efforts in bringing the paper to my attention.

In 1988 Vice President George Bush, the Republican presidential candidate, easily defeated his Democratic opponent, Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts, in Ohio. Recording a plurality of 476,920 and a winning proportion of 55.5%, Bush accomplished the feat of carrying fifteen of Ohio's twenty-one congressional districts and seventy-five of the Buckeye State's eighty-eight counties.

In 1992 the presidential contest was admittedly complicated by the well-publicized independent candidacy of Ross Perot. In sharp contrast to 1988 President Bush encountered serious political difficulty in Ohio. Bush's Democratic challenger, Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas, emerged victorious in Ohio, and Perot, reflecting his nationwide performance, attracted a respectable share of the popular vote. While the President carried sixty-one of Ohio's eighty-eight counties, Clinton prevailed in ten of the state's newly created congressional districts. The official results in Ohio were as follows:

Clinton	1,964,842	(40.4%)
Bush	1,876,445	(38.6%)
Perot	1,024,270	(21.0%)

In purely numerical terms Clinton received 25,013 more votes than the number accumulated by Dukakis in 1988, while Bush secured 540,104 less than the total he attracted in 1988. Even more noteworthy was the distribution of the major party presidential vote. The respective figures for 1988 and 1992 were:

	Percent	
	1988	1992
Republican	55.5	38.6
Democratic	44.5	40.4

Between 1988 and 1992 the Democratic share of the overall vote declined by a modest 4.1%, while the Republican share declined by an ominous 16.9%.

In 1988 Bush fared remarkably well in five of Ohio's major population centers, Hamilton, Franklin, Montgomery, Stark, and Butler Counties. These counties in 1988 actually provided Bush with more than sixty percent of his statewide plurality over Dukakis. The 1988 statistics were:

	Bush	Dukakis
Hamilton	227,904	140,354
Franklin	226,265	147,585
Montgomery	131,596	95,737
Stark	87,087	59,639
Butler	75,723	33,729
Total	767,677 (61.1%)	486,962 (38.9%)

In 1992 Bush managed to carry four of the five populous counties. In each of these political units, however, the President experienced considerable political erosion. The 1992 figures were:

	Bush	Clinton	Perot
Hamilton	189,224	145,027	57,161
Franklin	184,402	174,809	78,398
Montgomery	103,998	107,174	47,489
Stark	61,376	59,610	42,005
Butler	62,525	39,156	27,029
Total	601,562 (43.6%)	525,886 (36.6%)	254,033 (19.8%)

Between 1988 and 1992 Bush's aggregate plurality in the five counties dropped from 280,715 to 75,676. Of paramount importance was the distribution of the vote in the five counties. The statistics were:

	Percent	
	1988	1992
Republican	61.1	43.6
Democratic	39.9	37.6

While the Democratic vote went down by only 2.3%, the G.O.P. presidential vote fell by 17.5%.

In 1988 Dukakis was overwhelmed by Bush in southern and central Ohio and lost nearly all of the dozens of rural counties scattered throughout the state. Dukakis did succeed in carrying Cuyahoga, Summit, Lucas, Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties, all of which were essential urban in character. These five counties produced nearly forty percent of the statewide Democratic vote. The 1988 electoral statistics were:

	Dukakis	Bush
Cuyahoga	358,401	242,439
Summitt	112,612	101,155
Lucas	99,755	83,788
Mahoning	76,524	43,722
Trumbull	58,674	38,815
Total	694,967 (57.4%)	510,519 (42.6%)

In 1992 Clinton surpassed Dukakis' performance in the five counties, thereby assuring that he would carry Ohio. The 1992 results were:

	Clinton	Bush	Perot
Cuyahoga	333,700	184,996	111,217
Summitt	107,061	70,915	59,694
Lucas	98,771	62,659	17,453

	Clinton	Bush	Perot
Mahoning	64,144	30,863	29,124
Trumbull	54,142	25,618	25,503
Total	627,713 (49.5%)	385,050 (30.7%)	247,999 (19.8%)

Clinton in 1992 carried Ohio's First and Third Congressional Districts by very narrow margins, while Bush won the Sixth, Twelfth, and Sixteenth Congressional Districts by slim pluralities. Of obvious relevance to the outcome of the 1988 presidential contests in Ohio were the results in six densely populated congressional districts clustered in the northeastern corner of the state. Four of these districts were located in Cuyahoga County, while the other two were centered in Akron and Youngstown. The 1992 electoral figures were:

	Clinton	Bush	Perot
Tenth district	107,460	92,849	58,095
Eleventh district	167,877	37,880	23,423
Thirteenth district	101,184	94,651	70,624
Fourteenth district	119,144	81,803	60,338
Seventeenth district	133,213	68,417	64,936
Nineteenth district	114,307	106,950	60,429
Total	755,165	502,559	345,845

THE NEGOTIATED RATES ACT OF 1993

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 2121, the Negotiated Rates Act of 1993, under suspension of the rules. I am a cosponsor of this legislation because I believe that action must be taken to correct the freight undercharge problem. Bankruptcy trustees are suing for undercharge claims years after the fact, hurting many businesses in my district and across the country. If the bankrupt carriers failed to report the correct rates they had been charging, the customers should not be held at fault.

However, I voted against H.R. 2121 because I felt that this issue was too controversial to be considered under the Suspension Calendar. Some of my colleagues had expressed strong opposition to H.R. 2121, and I believed that the bill should have been given full consideration under the rules of the House before a vote was taken. Members of the House who do not serve on the Public Works and Transportation Committee were never given the opportunity to offer amendments to the bill. While I am glad that H.R. 2121 passed, I am disappointed that it was taken up under an expedited procedure that did not permit a well deserved debate.

DR. NAEEM RATHORE HONORED FOR THREE DECADES OF SERVICE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an

important event which will take place in my district on November 19. On that date, a number of foreign dignitaries, U.N. executives, and other important members of the international relations community will gather to honor Dr. Naem Rathore on the occasion of his 62d birthday for his long and illustrious service.

Dr. Rathore serves as advisor to the Executive Committee, Coordinating Committee of International Staff Unions and Associates, United Nations system of organizations. In this capacity, and over his entire career spanning three decades with the United Nations, Dr. Rathore has advised U.N. Secretary Generals and U.N. Ambassadors. His vision and leadership have made the world a better place for peoples across the globe.

A Pakistani citizen, Dr. Rathore has spent his life here in the United States. He graduated from the University of Michigan and won graduate fellowships from Columbia University, where he earned his masters and Ph.D. Since 1963, he has served in the United Nations in many different capacities. He has published a number of important articles, and is respected throughout the world as a voice for responsible peace. He is currently involved as coordinator of the Planning Committee of Pakistan Expatriates in the United Nations System.

Because of his tremendous work on behalf of the people of the world, I hope my colleagues will take this opportunity to recognize Dr. Rathore for his achievements and wish him a very happy 62d birthday.

NAFTA AND INTELLECTUALS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article in today's New York Times by A.M. Rosenthal entitled, "Nafta Hits Intellectuals." Mr. Rosenthal makes an impressive point that the academics and journalists supporting the North American Free-Trade Agreement have shown little compassion or any real understanding about the fears of working people who might lose their jobs under this agreement.

If the shoe were on the other foot and it was their jobs at risk, Mr. Rosenthal notes, they would have an altogether different attitude in their editorial pages and on the talk shows. He argues for some humility for the genuine fears of frightened workers and I strongly concur in his observations.

Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues' information I request that this New York Times article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

No need to worry. Nafta will not cost the job of a single American factory or agricultural worker. No plant or farm will be put out of business.

However, because of various complicated Nafta tax and anti-subsidy provisions, some other Americans will experience inconvenience.

Jobs will be lost by several hundred thousand editorial writers, columnists and other journalists, plus publishing executives, uni-

versity professors, Wall Street specialists and members of state and Federal legislative staffs. A few dozen think tanks will close down altogether.

But unemployment insurance will be available, often, for these newly unemployed intellectuals. And many may be retrained for jobs as newsroom receptionists, school custodians or clerks in automated warehouses.

Of course they must be flexible—willing to sell their homes, pull their children out of school and hunt for new jobs in other cities around the country. Many will find employment above the minimum wage, probably, if they take care not to be too old to compete with high school dropouts.

But being educated people they will also understand that contrasted to the possibility of a better balance of trade with Mexico their problems are entirely minor and not whine about it.

Anyway, perhaps things will pick up for them toward the end of the 90's.

Ah—all this has been my evil little fantasy these past couple of weeks. Ah—how they would howl, those journalistic and academic supporters of Nafta who have shown so little care, compassion or understanding about the fears of working people who might lose their jobs, how they would howl if their own jobs were in danger.

I can hear them already, because I have heard them so often before. If a newspaper is in danger of closing, or Wall Street brokers have a bad year, or if professors face loss of tenure for anything but murder, we fill pages of printed and hours of air time with sheer poignancy.

But we really do expect workers who lose their jobs after years at a craft or assembly line to be sweet and humble, because some day some other workers in some other factory may pick up jobs.

I was in favor of Nafta, though I never did think the Republic would collapse, America be driven from the company of decent nations and extra-terrestrials take over if it did not pass. But now the Administration and the intelligentsia have converted me to opposition to the current version of Nafta.

The genuine fears of frightened workers are dismissed contemptuously by the Clinton Administration, press and academia. If that is true now, while workers are still fighting, what care will be shown them or their thoughts if they are defeated and find themselves out of work in the name of grander interest?

I am a company man; any union that threatens my paper, watch out. But that does not turn me into some kook union-hater, spilling over with rage at unions exercising their right to lobby.

The Administration's attack on the whole A.F.L.-C.I.O. and its leaders is not only unjust, but damaging to freedom movements everywhere.

When it was not at all fashionable, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and Lane Kirkland, its president, came to the quiet assistance of freedom fighters, dissidents and political prisoners throughout Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The U.S. will need Kirklands again.

But Mr. Kirkland is suddenly painted Mussolini and his members a bunch of know-nothing boobs.

Workers fear that Nafta would preserve child labor, abysmal wages and government-police union-busting in Mexico. All of these are brutally unfair to Mexicans and to competing U.S. workers. And in case anybody cares about such niceties, Mr. Kirkland argues they also run counter to provisions in U.S. free-trade laws.

But if this version of Nafta is defeated, American business, labor and government still have a chance to try to negotiate a Nafta that would open Mexico not only to free trade but to free unions and halfway decent pay.

President Clinton says he needs Nafta as a message of support to the Asian summit meeting in Seattle. If he loses, maybe the message will be even stronger: In Asia as in the U.S. and Mexico, Americans are against slave wages, forced labor, child labor and government union-smashing.

Aren't we supposed to be?

CHILDREN OF SPANISH HARLEM DISCOVERY DAY

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, November 19, Community School District 4 in Spanish Harlem, in conjunction with the U.S. Postal Service will celebrate "Children of Spanish Harlem Discovery Day" with special activities commemorating the 500th anniversary of Puerto Rico.

The event will take place as part of the Columbus Pageant held at P.S. 101, the Andrew Draper Academy, where over 10,000 letters to future generations written by the district's third to sixth grade pupils will be sealed in a time capsule. On the following day copies of these letters bearing the new Christopher Columbus commemorative stamp will be hand canceled and sent to grade school children in San Juan, PR.

Mayor Dinkins and Mayor-Elect Giuliani, who will officiate over this marvelous ceremony, will themselves write letters for the time capsule, as will Puerto Rican community leaders and celebrities. And the letters sent to the school children of San Juan are only the first in what is expected to be a longstanding pen pal exchange between the children of Spanish Harlem and their Puerto Rican counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to all who were involved in this visionary undertaking. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Veronica O. Collazo, U.S. Postal Service Vice President for Diversity Development; Marcelino Rodriguez, superintendent of Community School District 4; Alexander Castillo, principal of P.S. 101; Assistant Principal Iris Denizac; and Iris Molina, president of the Andrew Draper Academy Parent Teacher Association. In this quincennial of Puerto Rico, they and all of the students, staff, and friends of Community School District 4 have helped launch a new age of discovery for the children of Spanish Harlem.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF KRISTALNACHT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to observe the 55th

anniversary of Kristalnacht, the "Night of Broken Glass," which preceded the Holocaust. The black moment in history signaled to the world the evil determination of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany's systematic destruction of the Jewish people. As the world stood by, this abomination took place.

The tide of anti-Semitism was given impetus when Herschel Grynszpan shot a young diplomat, Ernst vom Rath, at the German Embassy in Paris. Herschel's father was one of the many families driven out of Germany by Hitler's forces. On November 7, 1938, the young Herschel Grynszpan, in despair, went to the German Embassy in Paris to shoot the Ambassador. But instead, Herschel shot the young diplomat. Hitler's response was what now stands in history as Kristalnacht.

On the afternoon of November 9, Rath died. Anti-Jewish riots in the district of Kurhessen and Magdeburg-Anhalt broke out. Adolf Hitler secretly sanctioned the riots and purportedly discouraged any official interference when the riots spread throughout Germany.

Kristalnacht was a night of despair for the Jews in Germany, with police standing by as witnesses of the death, destruction and beatings which took place throughout Germany. Official count of the destruction included 814 shops, 171 homes and 191 synagogues torched; 36 Jews were killed and another 36 seriously injured. The horror continued and by November 12, an estimated 20,000 Jews had been shipped to concentration camps.

These numbers may seem small indeed when compared to the historical figures of 11 million people, of whom 6 million were Jews, that perished under Hitler's reign of terror. Nazism sought not only to exterminate all the Jews in the world, but to eradicate even the memory of their existence.

Kristalnacht marked the introduction of Hitler's governmentwide strategy to answer the Jewish question. The Holocaust was Adolph Hitler's final solution.

The Holocaust was not merely a continuation of traditional patterns of anti-Semitism, differing in scope and scale from that which Jewish people experienced for centuries. The Holocaust represented a specific type of evil, a systematic and bureaucratically organized evil, sponsored by the state and using all of the power and mechanisms available to a modern government to identify, concentrate and ultimately annihilate the Jewish people.

As we take pause to reflect upon this event, we must remember that anti-Semitism rears its ugly head even today.

At a time when we all should be jubilant at the prospect of real peace in the Middle East, racist outbreaks of hatred and violence appear to be on the rise in the United States and abroad. My own home State of Connecticut recorded 58 anti-Semitic incidents in 1992, up from 47 in 1991. These deplorable acts underscore the fact that anti-Semitism is alive and well far into the 20th century and did not end with the Holocaust.

As a nation founded on the premise that all men are created equal, we must be vigilant. We must not ignore or tolerate acts of hatred. To do so creates an environment where such actions are legitimized and accepted. We have to strengthen our commitment to fight the persecution of all peoples and to intensify our ef-

forts in creating an atmosphere where freedom and tolerance prevail.

On this day of remembrance, we must all make a solemn vow to destroy this evil which continues to weave itself throughout the history of humanity.

COMMENDING SENATOR SIDNEY LEE ON HIS SELECTION FOR THE GALLERY OF DISTINGUISHED ENGINEERING ALUMNI

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend former Virgin Islands Senator Sidney P. Lee on his selection by the University of Pennsylvania's School of Engineering and Applied Science to be honored in the Gallery of Distinguished Engineering Alumni.

Senator Lee was chosen for this prestigious honor because of the many contributions he has made to his profession and to his community, particularly the Virgin Islands.

After a dedication ceremony on October 19, 1993 in Philadelphia, Senator Lee's photograph will hang in the gallery where his accomplishments will serve as an example for today's graduate students.

The following biography appeared in the program honoring Senator Lee:

SIDNEY P. LEE, BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ENGINEERING (CHEMICAL ENGINEERING), SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE 1939

Sidney P. Lee is a four-term U.S. Virgin Islands Senator, civic and civil rights leader, environmental entrepreneur, businessman, philanthropist and educator. He graduated first in his class in chemical engineering in 1939 and earned an M.S. degree in chemical engineering from Cornell University in 1940. Following employment at ARCO Chemical, he founded Associated Dallas Laboratories (ADL), a pioneer in the field of environmental testing, certification of architectural materials, and transistor analysis. Among his numerous professional affiliations, he is a fellow of the American Institute of Chemists. Senator Lee pursued his passion for politics and community development in Texas, serving as President of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce and President of the Texas Junior Chamber of Commerce. In 1945, he was selected by the Jaycee's as one of the five Outstanding Young Men in the United States. Transferring his business acumen and political savvy to the U.S. Virgin Islands in the 1960's, Senator Lee led the fight to eradicate discrimination against under-represented minorities. As President of the Virgin Islands Board of Realtors, he was instrumental in eliminating discriminatory deed restrictions which prevented the purchase of homesites by African-Americans and Hispanics. Senator Lee held a number of prominent positions in the U.S. Virgin Islands Senate, including Vice President of the Senate; Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Home Rule, and Interstate Cooperation; Vice Chairman of the Committee on Finance; and Chairman of the Committee on Housing and Planning. He reorganized the government employees retirement system and the labor-management system and was an effective advocate for major

industrial investment in the region's economy. As first Chairman of the Board of Education for the U.S. Virgin Islands, and later as President of the Governor's Advisory Council of Vocational Education, Senator Lee championed universal access to higher education. Creator and financier of the DREAM Foundation, Senator Lee has personally guaranteed a class of 29 underprivileged children their college tuition at an institution of their choice.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS F. WALLER

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Thomas F. Waller, publisher of the Daily Gazette of Taunton, MA, and a prominent community leader, who passed away after a short illness on October 31.

Mr. Waller became publisher of the Daily Gazette in 1989, but had ties to Taunton since 1985 through his work as an editorial consultant in the Boston division of Thomson Newspapers, the parent company of the Daily Gazette. His distinguished career in journalism also included stints as managing editor of the Sturbridge Herald Star in Ohio from 1979 to 1985 and as news editor of the Fairmont Times in West Virginia from 1970 to 1979.

Despite more than 20 years in journalism, Mr. Waller never allowed the often cruel realities of life that reporters face daily to jade his optimistic view of the world. This optimistic view was evidenced by his professional and personal actions to better the community his newspaper served. As publisher of the Daily Gazette, he expanded the newspaper's involvement in the community, not only in its editorial capacity, but also by encouraging newspaper employees to get involved in the community they served. In the latter area, he led by example. He served as president-elect of the Heart of Taunton Inc., which worked to revitalize the downtown area, played an integral part in forming the Taunton Literacy Council in 1991, an organization which helps adults learn to read, and lent his talents to the United Way of Greater Taunton, serving on its board of directors.

Mr. Waller leaves his wife, Sandy, and their three children, Jennifer, Brian and Becky. They have lost a loving husband and father. The entire city of Taunton has lost a dedicated and caring community leader.

TRIBUTE TO REV. FRANK WHITE

HON. DAN HAMBURG

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding community activist from the First District of California, Rev. Frank White of the First Presbyterian Church in Napa.

Frank White is well known to local elected officials and the community as a tireless advo-

cate for the most vulnerable members of the community.

Observing the increasing number of homeless single adults in the community, he opened the doors of his church gymnasium to provide emergency shelter. He then worked with a homeless coalition and the Napa County Board of Supervisors to develop a temporary shelter.

When an additional shelter was needed for women and children, Frank was right there seeking the necessary funding and community support. He also coordinates a homeless prevention fund, a source of emergency money to keep people from becoming homeless.

Frank began the hot meal program in Napa known as The Table which serves a hot meal 6 days a week at the church, providing food to anyone in need—no questions asked.

Frank was one of the leaders who established the community counseling center to assist those who were falling through the cracks of private and public mental health programs.

When budget cuts lead to the loss of the county crisis center Frank assisted in the development of a mental health drop-in center.

When a community crisis was created by the unanticipated arrival of skinheads, Frank's response was to assist in the founding of Napa for Unity, a group dedicated to emphasizing the multicultural values in the community.

Frank never limits his expectations of support to the members of his church; consequently, he has involved vast numbers of people in the community in the above projects. His ecumenical expectations have led to community involvement even in his annual Holocaust Memorial and his Easter morning service in the park.

Rev. Frank White exemplifies leadership and community spirit. Hard work has never deterred him. He initiates major new programs with faith that the funding and the people will be found to make them succeed. He has been one of those essential leaders who function as the social conscience of a community, giving hope for a better future.

I join the citizens of the first congressional district in profound gratitude for Reverend White's service and leadership.

IN TRIBUTE TO HARRY KUBO

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues today to honor the achievements of Harry Kubo, whom I have known for more than two decades and who is recognized in my area as the champion of the agricultural industry.

For his achievements, Harry is rightfully being recognized as the 1993 Agriculturalist of the Year sponsored by the Fresno Chamber of Commerce.

Harry is president of the Nisei Farmers League, and he has been its only president since it was organized with his help 20 years ago during the farm labor strife in California's San Joaquin Valley. It was under his guidance

and leadership that the Nisei Farmers League has grown to become an organization of more than 1,000 members of all nationalities and cultural backgrounds who farm from Merced County to Tulare and Kern Counties.

It was through his guidance that the Nisei Farmers League has gained a prominent role in providing leadership in many areas that affect growers and farmworkers in their daily lives.

Harry was born in Sacramento in 1922. He was raised in Loomis and attended schools in the Placer area. Harry graduated from Placer Union High School, and attended Placer Junior College, now known as Sierra Junior College.

Harry and his wife, Mary, have five children and now reside in Parlier where he is in partnership with his son, Larry, and brother, George, in farming 120 acres of grapes, trees, and row crops.

He has been active in several agricultural organizations, including president of the Agricultural Action Committee and as a commissioner representing the United States in the Commission of the Californias. Harry is currently president of the Farm Labor Alliance, Inc., and the California Fresh Fruit Growers, a board member representing agriculture in the Fresno City and County Chamber of Commerce, as well as chief operating officer of the Agricultural Exports of California.

Harry served for 18 years as a member of the board of trustees of the Parlier Unified School District and currently is a board member of the Selective Service System and the board of directors of the State Center Community College Foundation.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET McCORD

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this legislative body is the opportunity we occasionally get to publicly acknowledge outstanding citizens of our Nation.

I rise today to recognize one such individual, Margaret McCord, on the occasion of her 90th birthday, November 20, 1993. She immigrated to this country from Scotland, and has been a hard worker all her life and an active member of the community for more than 60 years. She is a founder of the Plumb Beach Civic Association and a deacon of the Homecrest Presbyterian Church. Through years of service to Plumb Beach Civic, Margaret has demonstrated her true commitment to the community. Her generosity of time and energy embody the qualities of a good citizen; Margaret McCord has touched the lives of so many people in Brooklyn with her kindness and goodwill.

Her work has been an inspiration to me. She approaches challenges with a dogged determination that makes her a pleasure to know. I am sure I speak on behalf of many members of the community who have experienced the benefits of Margaret's hard work when I thank this remarkable individual on this special occasion.

ROUND TWO: A KINDER GENTLER
DARWINISM

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my favorite philosopher is Archy the Cockroach. He was a character invented by Don Marquis in the 1920's. Archy was a poet who died and came back in the body of a cockroach. He would crawl out of the woodwork at night, climb up on the typewriter and type little messages which would then be published in the newspaper the next day. One of the messages he left was: "There is always a comforting thought in time of trouble when it is not our trouble."

That is the message that the comfortable economists and the comfortable columnists are sending today to comfort those in this society who will be left high and dry in America.

Russell Baker in the New York Times wrote the following column on Saturday which has some thoughtful observations about those who will be left behind on NAFTA and our obligations to them.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 13, 1993]
THE SHORT-RUN AMERICA
(By Russell Baker)

The bleak side of capitalism is the ruin it leaves behind after, having worked its magic, it moves on. Backers of the North American Free Trade Agreement are naturally reluctant to dwell on this gritty historical fact, yet there is something cruel, offensive and faintly dishonest in their argument that any pain felt by the working classes will be only a "short-run" experience.

The argument comes easily to people with the financial security required to live in the "long run." Corporate America and the Washington establishment, both ardent for this agreement, consist of people who can afford to wait for the year of Jubilee.

For working stiffs, however, life is lived in the "short run." The rent is due at the end of the month, the grocery money every Friday. Politicians, tycoons and media stars exhorting such people to ponder the comforts to come in the "long-run" can only sound like hypocrites or visitors from another planet.

The truth most likely is that the agreement will indeed bring benefits in the long run to something called "society," which will include the comfortable people now hot for free trade. History, both modern and antique, suggests that it will also bring a great deal of ruin to the people who now fear losing their jobs.

Besides trying to sell the empty notion that everything will work out in a long run that is meaningless to many working people, advocates of the agreement should also be thinking of ways to deal with some of the ruin inescapable for short-run people.

An unpleasant characteristic of capitalism is the ruination it periodically creates: ruined landscapes, ruined societies, ruined people. Since capitalism is the national dish, we ought to be aware of this dark side of its nature so we can be ready to soften its nastiest results as it rollicks from place to place, first doing out money prodigiously, then suddenly skipping town and leaving a wasteland behind.

In this fashion it made England rich with the Industrial Revolution and introduced a

century of human misery. In America it has left ruined New England mill towns, a "rust belt" of ruined steel towns, ruined railroad towns from one end of the continent to the other and, most recently with more to come, ruined auto towns like Flint, Mich.

Mining has left the ruined landscapes of West Virginia and Kentucky, the real-estate boom has left the ruined farmlands of the lush Piedmont, the miraculous chemical industry has left ruined flora and fauna, and the auto industry has left a ruined sky and a junkyard ruin in every other town in America.

State capitalism is now showing that it too can turn boom to ruin. For details, see Joan Didion's recent New Yorker article about the ruin of the California town that lived high and fat until military-spending cuts shut off the Pentagon's money to McDonnell Douglas that had made it boom.

The problems created when capitalism visits these periodic ruins upon us include despair, anger, misery, hatreds, social upheaval and the rise of new political ideas, some dangerously crackpot, others as dangerously intellectual as Karl Marx's Communism, one result of the ruins of the industrial revolution.

Some sort of dangerous economic disturbance is obviously in progress. American labor is being priced out of jobs by East Asian workers who will do the same work for less. American retailers now fill their racks with low-priced clothing made by sweated child labor in South Asia.

Even more alarming is the recent trend in industry's extensive firings: first, blue-collar workers, then white-collar people, then lower-level technicians, and now middle- and upper-management people. Some say this is the work of the computer, which enables industry to keep production high while drastically cutting employment.

In brief, the people who say it's a new world and we'd better face it quickly have a point. Unfortunately, they are not being honest about the price many people will have to pay. In this computerized world they don't even talk much about maybe retraining old-timers who are potential losers to use computers. This isn't surprising; our schools don't even prepare many young people to qualify for employment in this new cybernetic America.

CLARIFICATION OF REA OVERSIGHT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN BORROWERS

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. E DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to clarify the regulatory authority the Rural Electrification Administration is to exercise with respect to a borrower whose net worth exceeds 110 percent of the outstanding principal balance of all loans made or guaranteed to the borrower by REA.

The legislation would amend section 306E, which was added to the Rural Electrification Act by Public Law 103-129, approved November 1, 1993.

The intent of new section 306E is to ensure the elimination of outdated and burdensome requirements and controls imposed on any

REA borrower whose net worth exceeds 110 percent of the borrower's outstanding loan balance.

The legislation I am introducing would amend section 306E to make it clear that REA is to minimize the imposition of such controls and requirements.

At the same time, the legislation would amend section 306E to make it clear that the Administrator of REA is to be a prudent administrator and ensure that the security for any loan made or guaranteed by REA is adequate. Section 306E would be further amended by the legislation to specifically state that nothing in the section limits the authority of the Administrator to establish terms and conditions with respect to the use by borrowers of the proceeds of loans made or guaranteed by REA or to take any other action authorized by law.

HONORING SAMUEL AND
ANGELINA MARTINO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize today the golden anniversary of my constituents, Samuel and Angelina Martino, which falls on December 23, 1993.

Fifty years ago, these two New York City natives were married during Sam's army leave just prior to his assignment overseas during World War II. Their three children have planned a festive affair to compensate for the formal wedding and honeymoon the couple never had the chance to take due to Sam's service responsibilities.

Sam and Angelina have lived a full and productive life together. They worked hard for many years—Sam at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and for New York Telephone, and Angelina as a medical secretary—in order to provide for their family. They have been active in the community, with the Boy and Girl Scouts of America, the St. Gabriel's School PTA and the Organization for Italian Migration. Most of all, they are proud of their children and the five grandchildren they have been blessed with.

I know of many people like Sam and Angelina, in my district and throughout the city of New York, who have built solid families and contributed to their communities. It is always a pleasure to have an opportunity to congratulate and thank them. I wish Sam and Angelina Martino a happy 50th anniversary and hope they have many more years of happiness and good health together.

CONGRATULATING RICHARD
MILBOURNE, SR., 60 YEARS IN
BUSINESS

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate Mr. Richard

Milbourne, Sr., who recently celebrated the 60th anniversary of his business, the Acme Iron Works, located in Prince Georges County.

Mr. Milbourne, who resides in College Park, in the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, is 83 years old and is generally the first of his 30 employees to arrive and the last to leave at Acme Iron Works.

The Acme Iron Works has performed work on the U.S. Capitol, as well as the National Gallery of Art, the University of Maryland, and the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center. Recently a story appeared in the Prince George's Journal which told of the remarkable career of Richard Milbourne, Sr.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the outstanding career of the owner of Acme Iron Works, Richard Milbourne, Sr.

[From the Prince George's Journal Nov. 4, 1993]

IN BUSINESS 60 YEARS: HARD-WORKING OWNER MAKES ACME IRON WORKS GO

(By Katherine Greet)

Richard G. Milbourne arrives at Acme Iron works in Tuxedo every work day at 7:30 a.m., and he's often the last person to leave at night. Just like it's been for six decades.

The 83-year-old College Park resident recently celebrated the 60th anniversary of his business, which did its first job Sept. 18, 1933—a door replacement at the National University Law School in Washington that netted \$16.60.

The firm now employs 30 people and earns about \$1.5 million a year—although, Milbourne notes, it "goes up and down." Its client list has grown to include some of the region's most prominent institutions, from universities to retail chains to government agencies.

"The further I follow, the bigger his footsteps get," said Richard P. Milbourne, who joined his father's firm as a summer employee at the age of 14.

The younger Milbourne called his father "the socio-economic glue that holds Acme together. He knew everyone in this county and still does. He is the grand old man of Prince George's County."

"Not many area small businesses of that nature manage to survive with the same person at the helm, not with the same person as the president of the company for that many years," said Chuck Leak, sales representative for the Posner Steel Co., Acme's main supplier for a quarter-century. "It's the typical American Dream."

More than most people, Milbourne understands the risk of entrepreneurship. After several years of apprenticeship. After several years of apprenticeship in the iron trade—during which he went from earning the then princely sum of \$13.20 a week to being laid off—he started Acme with \$900 in savings in the midst of the Great Depression. He attributes his initial success to a slow and steady flow of work.

"You had to move along slowly. I was able to procurework and add one man and then another and another," he recalled. "I did a lot of the fabricating myself back then, worked day and night, started off in a small place until it was built up and could move to a larger warehouse." He chose the name Acme to represent the company as "the tops"—and because he "wanted it to be the first one in the phone book."

Since then, Acme has performed work ranging from repairs at cemeteries to renovations at the Capitol and the National Gallery of Art to installing an ornamental

staircase at the home of then Sen. Lyndon Johnson. Milbourne moved the firm to its present Frolich Lane location in 1966, buying 3½ acres and building four warehouses, three of which are rented out.

Variety has remained a staple of the Acme, whose current client list includes the University of Maryland and Howard University; Peoples Drug; Rosecroft Raceway; NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center; and several churches, schools, businesses and government agencies. Most of its work today comes through bidding for jobs from contractors and real estate developers, but it isn't limited to the building trades—Acme-designed golf bag storage racks are sold at pro shops throughout the United States, Japan and Europe.

"Acme does excellent work and is not the type of company to take short cuts," said Leak, who described the elder Milbourne as "honest as the day is long, dedicated and hard-working."

Milbourne now runs the firm with his son, a University of Maryland engineering graduate, and two son-in-laws, Jack Heniecke and Rod Easterling. He attributes his continued success to "having dedicated people that have stayed with us. * * * We've had two retirees over the past 10 years."

He said Acme managed to stay strong during the recession, despite the slump in the real estate and construction industries that provide much of its work.

"We felt some recession, but kept busy, managed to get through with no layoffs," Milbourne said. "And business is increasing."

CONGRATULATIONS, VIVIAN SANKS KING

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Vivian Sanks King, Esq. on her appointment as vice president of legal management at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey [UMDNJ]—New Jersey's health sciences university. This weekend a distinguished group of leaders will gather at a reception in her honor.

In her capacity as vice president, she manages the university's legal office which provides services to four campuses throughout the State. The university is composed of seven schools which include three medical schools, a dental school, a school of health related professions, a school of graduate biomedical sciences, and a recently established school of nursing, as well as the university's two community mental health centers. Ms. King also teaches a health law class for university and hospital faculty/staff, and legal writing to young people at the summer institute for pre-legal studies sponsored by Rutgers University and Seton Hall Law School.

The vice presidency position she now holds is not the first relationship Ms. King has had with UMDNJ. Prior to attending Seton Hall Law School, Ms. King was coordinator and then director of media relations at UMDNJ—University Hospital. Immediately preceding her present appointment she was associate di-

rector of UMDNJ. She has risen through the ranks at UMDNJ and therefore knows the structure, the problems and solution avenues, and can hit the ground running in her new capacity.

Ms. King, a lifelong resident of Newark, NJ, has always been an active member of our community. She is a role model and a mentor, she serves on numerous boards in the community. Ms. King is a frequent lecturer at hospitals, universities, and professional associations on the legal aspects of AIDS and other health care issues. She is a committed community activist.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this staunch community minded attorney lives in the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey. It is a testament to her dedication to her community that she has stayed involved and worked to make our community better. She deserves the accolades that we bestow on her this week. I ask my colleagues to join me as I thank Ms. King for her good works.

NAFTA WILL PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the North American Free-Trade Agreement is the most important measure that Congress will debate this year. By bringing down trade barriers among Canada, Mexico, and the United States, NAFTA promises a bright future of economic expansion, job growth, and prosperity for what will be the world's single largest trading block. It is already apparent that NAFTA signatories will be the envy of the world, the leaders in what is quickly becoming a global economy.

But, NAFTA will not only be an economic boon for North America; it will also help us focus our resources and address environmental concerns. It is hard to believe that those who call themselves environmentalists would oppose this agreement, the greenest trade agreement ever negotiated. Will a defeat of NAFTA help address environmental concerns that will accompany future industrial expansion? Will the defeat of NAFTA make Canada and Mexico more responsible for environmental preservation? Will the defeat of NAFTA help clean up the notorious United States-Mexico border area? The answer to all three of these questions is a resounding "No."

However, the passage of NAFTA will advance these causes. In the future, companies will take into account the adverse effects that expansion could have on the environment, and they will work to mitigate these effects. NAFTA's environmental side agreement will give participants recourse in the case of one party's environmental misconduct. And, the agreement will lead to a much heightened awareness and concentration of funding on the environmental problems of our border with Mexico.

The issue is a clear one: The way we move forward with our efforts to improve the environment is to pass NAFTA. Mr. Speaker, I request that the following article be submitted into the record after my statement.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 11, 1993]

GREEN SMOKE SCREEN
(By Jessica Mathews)

There is no green curtain to hide behind on NAFTA.

If the question were whether the agreement could have been greener, the answer would be yes. That isn't the issue now, and claims to support "a NAFTA" but not "this one" are disingenuous at best.

The question is whether the environment will be better off with this NAFTA or without it. And to that the answer is simple. The environment in Mexico and the United States and—because of the agreement's wider implications for world trade—in the world as a whole, will benefit if NAFTA passes.

Environmental complaints against NAFTA fall into three groups: complaints about what it doesn't do, complaints about what it does and a closet argument against growth per se. The first is the easiest to dispose of.

NAFTA has been criticized for not tilting Mexico's energy policies away from fossil fuels and toward energy efficiency, for not dealing with toxic dumping, for not addressing agricultural policy. You name it. These arguments mistake the purpose of a trade agreement. It is not an all-purpose vehicle for remaking other countries' environmental policies as we might like them to be. These critics in effect condemn NAFTA for failing to secure Mexican and Canadian agreement to policies that have been and remain the subject of fierce debate in the United States.

Objections to what the agreement does do are a mixed bag of scare tactics, wild exaggerations and valid concerns. No matter how many times you've read it, don't worry about your food safety: It's fully protected. Discard the argument that funding for border cleanup is inadequate: It's vastly more than there is now or than there would be if NAFTA were defeated.

Ignore the trumpeted claim that NAFTA threatens American environmental sovereignty and is "a major step toward ending democracy in this country." This one—there is no polite way to put this—is pure nonsense. American laws will still be made and amended by Congress and the states. The criteria by which they may be challenged under the agreement are reasonably drawn. The Constitution stands.

Though it misses, this claim does glance off one of NAFTA's environmental defects: a country's right to set process (as opposed to product) standards. Process standards deal with how a product is made, grown or harvested. It was an American process standard—namely, the Marine Mammal Protection Act—that was struck down in the infamous GATT tuna-dolphin decision, which held that all tuna must be treated alike, whether it is harvested carefully or in a way that indiscriminately kills dolphins.

NAFTA recognizes governments' right to use such measures to protect the environment—the first trade agreement to do so.

However, in practice these standards are tricky to interpret: whether they are a disguised restriction on trade; whether they are scientifically based; whether they are non-discriminatory. It is in the procedure by which such disputes are to be resolved that NAFTA falls down. Though NAFTA's rules are more open than GATT's—a small step forward—they do not remotely meet American standards of due process, fairness and transparency, and they rightly merit criticism.

The agreement's other weakness lies in how it treats global treaties that use trade

sanctions to protect the environment. Even though sanctions are sometimes the only way to give such treaties teeth, their legitimacy under trade law is still in question. NAFTA accepts the three existing environmental treaties that use trade sanctions—global agreements on endangered wildlife, ozone depletion and hazardous waste—but only these. It would have been far better if the agreement had instead established the general principle.

The most pernicious arguments against NAFTA use any of the foregoing to disguise the fear that NAFTA will accelerate growth, and therefore environmental degradation, in Mexico. Looking at the atrocity that rapid industrialization has wrought on the border, it is easy to see where this view comes from.

But to buy into it, even subconsciously, is to reject everything environmentalists have been fighting to make people understand for the past decade. The world's choice cannot be between growth and no-growth. It's the kind of growth that matters, and making sure that it's the kind that brings long-term benefits is as important as securing the growth itself.

That's why trade negotiators have to learn to be environmentalists and why the environmental mainstream is solidly behind this treaty. NAFTA's defeat would mean less immediate cleanup in Mexico, less growth, less environmental technology transferred through U.S. investment and less Mexican demand and capacity for environmental improvement (both of which rise with income). It would wipe out the precedents this agreement sets for other trade talks. And it could lay the base for a dangerous and retrograde environmental/protectionist alliance. If NAFTA goes down, the environment loses—now and later.

We don't have to like all of Mexico's or Canada's environmental or any other policies to recognize the value in what has been achieved. We're not getting married—just signing a trade agreement.

REBUKE OF POLICY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LESBIANS AND GAYS IN THE MILITARY

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today's decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ordering the Navy to grant Midshipman Joseph Steffan a Naval Academy diploma and an officer's commission represents a second consecutive judicial rebuke to the policy of discrimination against lesbians and gay men in our military services. Taken together with the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Terry Hatter of California in the Keith Meinhold case, this decision represents a vindication of the prediction by President Clinton that the military ban would not survive constitutional scrutiny by the courts.

By overturning the Navy's dismissal of Midshipman Steffan—6 weeks before his graduation from the Naval Academy—for the crime of admitting that he was gay, the appeals court has struck a powerful blow against the so-called don't ask, don't tell policy, under which such admission remains grounds for ouster from the military.

It is hard to state the case any better than Judge Abner Mikva did in his unanimous decision: "America's hallmark has been to judge people by what they do, and not by who they are." It is a principle we have accepted with respect to race, sex, religion and national origin. It is a principle President Clinton has articulated with respect to sexual preference. I can only hope that the President will be able to take "Yes" for an answer, accept this vindication of his position, and instruct the Justice Department not to appeal this decision and to drop its appeal of the Meinhold case.

FACES OF HEALTH CARE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts that Americans are calling for full-scale health reform, I invite them to visit the Third Congressional District of California. At townhalls, Fourth of July picnics, chamber of commerce meetings I hear a resounding call for the need to solve the crisis in our health care system, to give Americans the peace of mind that they will have access to affordable health care.

The people that have sent me to Washington are giving a strong and sure message. People are becoming increasingly insecure about whether our health care system will work during the times they need it most. To many of my constituents, health care is often a game of chance, a game where they believe the rules are often stacked against them.

Here are some of the current rules of the game. You can work your hardest to ensure that your family has health insurance, pay every premium in full—but in the terrible event that a family member is struck with a devastating illness, many people have no guarantees that their insurance company won't drop them.

But I do not want to merely list facts and statistics about the need for health reform. I want to tell the story of a family that I met earlier this year that is just one of the many examples of the desperate need for health care reform in this Nation.

At a community hour in my district in Dixon, CA, I met the Drake family. For years this family of four received their health coverage through Mr. Drake's employment at a local drug store. However, the annual premium increases to keep this policy up were more than the Drake's could handle on their modest budget. Thus, the family was forced to switch to another policy so that they could afford their insurance.

It was shortly after this switch that the family was hit with some terrible news. Their 5-year-old son, Michael, was diagnosed with leukemia. Watching a child fighting for his life has to be the most painful and trying experience a parent faces. But regrettably, this was not the only fight the family had on their hands.

The family has to fight a battle with our health insurance system as well. You see, when the Drake family changed insurance policies, the new policy would only cover a tiny fraction of their son's leukemia treatment.

Under the loopholes of the insurance policy, the family had to be under this plan for 3

years before they would receive the full benefits of their insurance. When this family was most in need of health insurance, it simply was not there.

The Drakes worked hard, played by the rules, but in this case, the rules were stacked against them. With no insurance to help pay for medical expenses which currently total \$120,000, this Dixon family depleted their life savings to be eligible for Medicaid.

This is just one of the many sad stories I have heard in my district. And, unfortunately, there are many more stories like the Drake's. We must remember that the health care debate we have embarked on is not going to be conducted in a nameless, faceless fashion.

This debate will dramatically affect each and every one of the people who sent me here. This debate will determine if we will finally stand and deliver a health reform plan that will make the health care system in this country play by rules that are decent and fair. I am supporting President Clinton's health plan, because I have a responsibility to this family in Dixon.

I have a responsibility to let this body know that there are thousands of families in similar binds throughout my district. Although the details will vary, these families all are without the sense of security that the health care system is going to play fair.

I am resolved to go back to Dixon and tell this family that the time for health reform is now. I want to work for health reform that will allow a family to help their child fight for his life, instead of fighting a system where the rules are stacked against them.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today the House-half of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress finally began to consider what kind of recommendations it will make to the Congress before the end of the year.

While we got off to a rocky start this morning over disappointments with the less-than-bold chairman's mark put before us and over proposed procedural arrangements for voting on amendments, I am still hopeful we can strengthen the bill within the Joint Committee and on the House floor. I am pleased that Chairman HAMILTON has committed to a generous amendment procedure when this reaches the floor sometime early next year.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include excerpts from the excellent opening statement today of our House vice-chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], as well as my own opening statement:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID DREIER—JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

IN GENERAL

Unlike the document marked up by our counterparts in the Senate, this bill is neither bipartisan nor comprehensive. This is something I profoundly regret.

The Joint Committee was created to study Congress and make recommendations for reform. The culmination of seven months of hearings and two months of negotiations is a document that, on the most pressing issues, recommends more studies and nonbinding Sense of the House resolutions. We're back to ground zero.

A PRETENSE FOR DOING NOTHING

The mark calls for achieving a 12 percent reduction in the number of full-time staff, but it chooses Sept. 30, 1992, as the base. Consequently, few if any staff cuts would be achieved. According to the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, from fiscal year 1992 to fiscal year 1994, outlay reductions have fallen 6 percent in each year. According to Vic Fazio: "We are well on our way, halfway, to a 25 percent reduction." In terms of personnel, Mr. Fazio tells us that legislative staff have been reduced 8.2 percent over the same period. Under this scenario, the staff reductions have already been met.

The bill calls for biennial budgeting, yet the most important function of budgeting—the appropriations process—will remain annual. There is no rational reason for this. At our first hearing, Majority Leader Gephardt said in response to a question by Sen. Domenici about whether we should include appropriations in the biennial budget:

I don't see why we couldn't. We have a lot of Members around here who feel their service on an authorization committee is not a meaningful experience. It is in part because they never get to the authorization process; appropriations takes much of it over."

The committee mark calls for the elimination of any standing committee if the Membership falls below 50 percent of the number serving at the end of the 103rd Congress. Yet there is no requirement that the Rules Committee report a resolution to achieve this.

ON PROXY VOTING

We were told by numerous witnesses that if we reduced the number of committee and subcommittee assignments, there would be less need for proxy voting. One of the few meaningful reforms in the committee mark is that it reduces assignments. In addition, subcommittees would not be permitted to meet when full committees are meeting, so there is very little problem with overlap. Yet there are no restrictions on proxy voting. Even our freshman Democrat colleagues have proposed the elimination of proxy voting at subcommittee level. This is not a minority rights issue. It is an issue of accountability.

ON PROCEDURAL REFORMS

We in the minority are not asking for more rights. We're only asking that the standing rules of the House, as proposed and approved by the Democrat caucus, be adhered to.

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, you said at our very first hearing: "Expectations for this committee are very high, and in a sense we are all on the spot." That is still true today. The majority of our colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, are counting on us to produce a bipartisan, comprehensive package of reforms. Comprehensive means committee realignment, a reduction in bureaucracy, and fair and open debate. We have a number of amendments that if adopted, would accomplish this objective. The only things standing in the way of a bipartisan bill are the will and the desire to achieve it.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GERALD B. SOLOMON—JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. Chairman, while I have the greatest personal respect for you, I must express how deeply saddened I am that we have waited so long to consider so little.

When this Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was created in 1992, I had great hopes for its potential to truly reform this institution from top to bottom. And, that optimism was further bolstered by the seemingly unanimous opinion of our membership in the early days about the need to be bold.

When we had our retreat last summer, I thought we were all agreed that we would proceed to mark-up a bill in September. But that kept slipping until here we are, in the middle of November, in the last hectic week for the session, only beginning to mark-up what can most charitably be termed a minimalist approach to tinkering.

We are making a mockery of our own name. We are no longer joint and we are no longer organized. And we certainly are not demonstrating by this chairman's mark that we have a clue about how to properly organize the Congress.

In short, we have become the problem we were created to solve. We have become the very model of what is wrong with the legislative process in this House—procrastination without deliberation or representation.

By ceding our bipartisan and independent judgment to the majority leadership you have produced a document that may be acceptable to the Leadership Lions and Committee Bulls, but does not begin to address the concern of most Members, let alone of the American people.

In summary, unless this bill is substantially altered to restructure and revitalize the clogged heart of the Congress, our committee system, then we should save ourselves the embarrassment of reporting to the House this band-aid cover-up of our real problems.

A HEMISPHERIC DIALOG: NATIONAL LEADERS SPEAK OUT ON THE BROADER MEANING OF NAFTA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1993, leaders from throughout the Western Hemisphere and regional experts delivered comments in support of the North American Free-Trade Agreement at "A Hemispheric Dialogue: National Leaders Speak on the Broader Meaning of NAFTA," sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank.

The following text includes comments by Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada, President of Bolivia; Cesar Gaviria Trujillo, President of Colombia; Rafael Leonardo Callejas R., President of Honduras; P.J. Patterson, Prime Minister of Jamaica; Luis Alberto La Calle, President of the Republic of Uruguay; and Peter Hakim, President of the Inter-American Dialog: GONZALO SANCHEZ DE LOZADA, PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA

NAFTA is of vital importance for the world, for our hemisphere, and for my country, Bolivia. By uniting the economies of

Canada, the United States, and Mexico. NAFTA creates the world's largest trading bloc. It will be like a sun, and the rest of the economies of our hemisphere will be like planets in orbit around it, bringing down trade barriers that exist between our nations and having, eventually, access to this wonderful system of free trade, standardization of democratic practices, labor laws and environmental sensitivity.

We can't underestimate how important NAFTA is as a symbolic message of inclusion and not of exclusion. For the first time in history, the countries of the developed world invite the underdeveloped world to join in the great project which will be a project to create wealth, to bring social justice and more equality in the framework of freedom.

We think that the dynamics of this market will be so important that it will oblige other trading blocs around the world to start to bring down the walls which they are building in preparation for trade wars. We think it will be what will lead the world into a truly world economy. And in this way, it will bring hope to the underdeveloped part of the world with work, with dedication to education and health, and care toward the environment. And with justice, we can export not just violence and drugs, but products, creativity, and value-added.

We must understand that without NAFTA things will be very dark indeed. With it, it will be a beacon of hope, although we know that time will go by before we're reincluded in that trading market. But we know that eventually, as we achieve certain standards and as we achieve levels of growth and maturity and development in our economies, we have the possibility of having trade and not only looking for aid.

As the Cold War has finished, there is no longer the incentive for the developed world to bring aid to our countries. And this means that we must look for trade. A country like Bolivia that stopped hyperinflation in democracy, the first country in Latin America to do so, and opened up its markets, and has achieved stability, not only economic but democratic stability—we know that we must have trade if we want to continue and if we want to have a future. And it is for this reason that we're so devoted to and so interested in seeing that NAFTA takes place, and we can look forward with confidence to the future, not with preoccupation and uncertainty.

CESAR GAVIRIA TRUJILLO, PRESIDENT OF
COLOMBIA

Throughout *** history, Latin America and the United States have striven to create a real partnership for the Americas, a relationship based on mutual benefit and equal opportunity. For years, we talked about the importance of having trade and not just receiving aid from the United States. But it was just talk, nothing else. In the past, foreign assistance was the predominant means by which the United States helped emerging nations to develop their economies. Until now, Latin American nations raised protectionist walls around themselves while the United States looked towards other markets to expand its trade.

Two developments have significantly altered that scenario: the North American Free Trade Agreement and the silent economic and democratic revolution undergone by Latin America. NAFTA is a watershed in our history. We view this initiative as a critical step towards the creation of a hemispheric free trade zone of democratic nations. NAFTA is a means to achieve greater

prosperity for all the Americas, north and south of the Rio Grande. It's also a tool for political change as well as for strengthening democracy and respect for human rights throughout the region.

My own country, Colombia, is an example of how economic integration and the opening of markets within a democratic framework can bring about progress and prosperity for its citizens. The Colombian government is deeply committed to trade reform and reduced tariff rates from an average of 48% in 1987 to 11.4% today. As a result of this policy change, U.S. exports to Colombia increased a dramatic 68% last year, creating an estimated 45,000 new jobs for American workers. Members of the U.S. Congress who are uncertain as to whether NAFTA will be good for their constituencies have only to look at the example of the dynamic rise of U.S.-Colombian trade since its liberalization. Hasn't Colombia taken important steps to promote the kind of economy envisioned by NAFTA? As a result of these actions, our trade with a country like Venezuela increased from \$500 million in 1990 to \$1 billion in 1992, and they reached approximately \$1.5 billion at the end of the current year.

You may ask yourself, What does all this have to do with NAFTA? A great deal. NAFTA is a continuation of the trade liberalization process under way throughout Latin America, including negotiations of MERCOSUR, the Andean Pact, the G3 (Colombia, Venezuela and Mexico) as well as the talks to reduce Central American and Caribbean tariffs. Colombia and its South American neighbors support NAFTA because we believe it's a critical step to the economic integration of the Americas.

Given our successful experience, we are startled by the growing calls for isolationism and protectionism ignited by the NAFTA debate in some quarters of the United States. After all, the United States has benefited from developing successful trade relations around the world, and rising exports are driving the U.S. economic recovery. This demonstrates that free trade produces concrete economic benefits for everyone who has the courage to overcome initial fears.

As the U.S. Congress prepares to cast its historic vote on NAFTA, its members should be aware that it represents much more than just signing a trade treaty. Its passage or its defeat will have lasting effects on the entire continent. Moreover, NAFTA's defeat may stifle further progress, a loss for both industrialized and developing nations.

As President Clinton stated recently, the real job gains from NAFTA will come when we take the agreement and take it to Chile, to Argentina, to Columbia, to Venezuela, to other market-oriented democracies in Latin America and create a consumer market of 700 million people—soon to be over a billion people in the next century.

RAFAEL LEONARDO CALLEJAS R., PRESIDENT
OF HONDURAS

Barely one week ago in Guatemala, the presidents of six Central American countries, including mine, Honduras, unanimously approved absolute support of the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA. In spite of the uncertainties it generates in our own societies and economies, we understand that the free trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico opens a unique opportunity to generate increases in trade, and consequently, gains in economic growth, and therefore higher benefits for our people. All that we request is that NAFTA open the alternative for the six Central American

countries; that once we constitute ourselves into a free trade zone, we have access to NAFTA under conditions that make us competitive with the other partners, especially Mexico.

We don't fear this type of association because we believe—and I personally—that free trade is the alternative for economic development and growth. So why fear? Obviously in this new world there are winners and losers. Those who lose are the groups, the persons, the societies and countries that persist on a protectionist alternative. We believe, I believe, that competition is clearly associated with free trade; and therefore, I can stress that we hope that you support the NAFTA free trade agreement. And that once it is approved—which we hope it will be—then you will support us, the Central American countries, in order that jointly we can proceed to adapt ourselves and incorporate ourselves to the biggest market of the world.

The decision will change the realities of the whole Western Hemisphere, and it's most probable that when NAFTA is signed, other countries in the continent will be clearly adapted to this mentality. Let's go ahead, let's support NAFTA. Let's request that the Congress of the United States, the Senate of the United States, that they too understand the realities of globalization of this new world. And push forward. Obviously there are risks involved. But the biggest risk of all is not taking the right decisions with respect to NAFTA.

P.J. PATTERSON, PRIME MINISTER OF JAMAICA

The end of the Cold War that for so long dominated the world provided leaders and governments with a welcome opportunity to end their preoccupation with destruction and to concentrate their energies and resources on human development on this planet which we all inhabit.

Experience has shown that the free market system provides the best method by which to achieve economic growth and social development. For this system to be effective, there must be the opening of world markets and an end to protectionism. Tariff barriers must be removed. The world economy will be increasingly globalized, market driven and technologically oriented.

Here in Jamaica, we have taken the tough decisions to transform our economy into one that is market driven. My administration has, with unswerving determination, taken the road toward full transformation of our economy. We have begun the process of simplifying and improving the effectiveness of our tax and incentive systems. We are pursuing a policy of privatization. Our private sector is now taking up the challenge to move our economy into the 21st century of free trade, where competition is intense and protectionism is no more.

We in the Western Hemisphere must ensure that we are not left behind as other countries around the world develop regional trading blocs, large in size and of great market potential.

Within the Caribbean and Latin American region we have strengthened our economic and trading associations through CARICOM, the planned association of Caribbean states, and through new trading initiatives with the countries of Latin America.

We firmly believe that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) offers a unique opportunity to build mutually beneficial relationships between the three nations involved. We view NAFTA as the first important step towards a hemispheric free trade area that has the potential to lift the

standard of living of the people of this hemisphere, thereby ensuring the spread of democracy and the maintenance of political stability.

We believe the coming into being of NAFTA would mark a historic moment for the people of the hemisphere and the people of the world. As with every new experience, there will be moments of initial apprehension. There will be the need for adequate transitional provisions. But it is indeed a bold step in the direction that we all must take.

LUIS ALBERTO LACALLE, PRESIDENT OF THE
REPUBLIC OF URUGUAY

The people and government of Uruguay are following with great interest these final stages of negotiation of the treaty amongst the governments of Canada, Mexico and the United States. We see it as a very important milestone in the history of the end of the 20th century. We see it as a natural tendency of uniting markets, of creating wider economic zones. That is a tendency we see the world over. But in this case, as Mexico belongs to Latin America, we see it as a historical step toward renewed and more fruitful relationship between North America and its southern neighbor Mexico. And of course, we see it as a signal that perhaps in the future we will be able to widen that kind of cooperation.

It is true the history of the United States tells us very loudly that trade and prosperity through the opening of markets is a reality. That everybody benefits when there is more trade. That jobs will be created. That opportunities will be also created. So we do think that it is in the best philosophy and interest of the concerned parties in the first place. But it is also in the best interest of a more developed and deep relationship with the rest of Latin America that this treaty be approved. These days, when we see that trade is the central issue of politics, when people are demanding more than anything to be able to trade more freely and to generate opportunities, we do think that this is a step in a very positive direction.

My colleagues here in South America, we recently had a meeting in Santiago de Chile, and it was in the center of our discussions: the final decision on the NAFTA treaty. So if I could convey to the people of Congress in the United States, to the people in business, to the labor unions, some kind of message, I would say that the rest of America is looking very keenly at this decision because it can be a signal of better days for everybody. We are thinking not in terms of one administration, of one government, but in terms of creating more stable economic relationships, and of course through that, more stable institutions, and stronger democracy all over America.

We are no longer as Latin Americans part of a problem; we are part of the solution. Many millions of jobs in the United States depend on trade with Latin America. I would almost say all of our imports—80% of them—come from the United States. So all kinds of cooperation, all kinds of opening of opportunities will be seen as a very positive sign, not only by governments, not only by presidents, but by the people that work and live in my country.

So, on behalf of the present but especially on behalf of the future, I would very strongly say that this decision—a positive decision on the NAFTA treaty—will be a historical decision and a very positive one. We will be waiting then, full of hope, for the final decision and thinking that it is for the good of the

countries involved, but especially for the whole of Latin America, for the whole of America in the future years.

REMARKS BY PETER HAKIM, PRESIDENT,
INTER-AMERICAN DIALOG

I want to thank Enrique Iglesias for his invitation to participate in this important forum. I am pleased to have this opportunity to share my views with you about the North American Free Trade Agreement and its significance for the future of United States' relations with the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean. I am not speaking today for the 100 members of the Inter-American Dialogue, but I believe that nearly all of them would express similar thoughts if they had the chance to be here.

I have been involved in inter-American affairs for the past 25 years. But it is only during the past few years that I have become encouraged about the opportunities for building a productive and enduring relationship between the U.S. and the nations of Latin America. For the first time, I can envision a relationship based on mutual respect and shared values—a relationship that will allow all Americans together to address our many shared problems and pursue our common aspirations. This is a goal for which many of us have worked hard over the years, and it may now, finally, be within our reach.

It is the United States that is now facing a moment of truth. The decision taken by Congress next week on NAFTA will critically shape the future of our relations with Latin America. Mexico—along with almost every other Latin American country—is calling for a new economic partnership with the United States. Congress must now choose whether to accept that offer of partnership or whether, as we have done too often in the past—to turn our backs on Latin America.

The members of Congress must understand that NAFTA is not a one-way street. The nations of Latin America are not seeking special privileges. They are not today asking for more aid or calling for debt relief. They are instead challenging us to accept an equal exchange. They are asking for the right to compete freely in U.S. markets, and offering us the reciprocal right to compete freely in their markets. This is a good deal for everyone. And it will allow all of us to compete more effectively in the global marketplace.

NAFTA is about far more than economics. Over the past several years, it has been heartening to see the emergence of democratic rule in country after country of Latin America. It has also been encouraging to witness the growing convergence of interests and values between the United States and Latin America. The main objectives of U.S. foreign policy—the building of democratic societies, the fostering of economic growth through competitive markets and the extension of social justice—are today the principal objectives of Latin America as well. With the approval of NAFTA we can lay an effective groundwork for the United States and Latin America jointly to pursue these fundamental human goals. Beyond its economic benefits, NAFTA symbolizes the common stake that we all share in the future of the hemisphere.

Some 15 years ago, the United States faced another decision crucially affecting its relations in the hemisphere: whether or not to restore Panama's sovereignty over the Panama Canal. After a long and difficult struggle, the U.S. chose the right path, a path befitting a great nation. The decision confronting Congress next week is even more momentous. The Panama Canal treaties put an end

to a historic wrong. NAFTA, in its turn, promises the beginning of a new relationship between the United States and the nations of Latin America—a relationship founded on common interests and sustained by growing economic and political cooperation.

The U.S. decision about NAFTA will say a great deal about the kind of nation we are and the kind of nation we want to be. It will answer a very basic question: Do we want to stand apart, isolating ourselves at a crucial point in a world of extraordinary changes—or do we want to assume leadership in the building of more satisfactory global arrangements. Only by grasping the opportunity presented by NAFTA to forge a sound and constructive relationship with our nearest neighbor, Mexico, can we set the stage for exercising responsible global leadership.

NORTH AMERICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT [NAFTA]

HON. PETER W. BARCA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the goal of any trade agreement, including this NAFTA, must be to expand economic growth, enhance the export opportunities of American businesses, and promote a higher standard of living so that businesses can create more family-supporting jobs for American workers. Generally, providing free and fair trade throughout the world has helped to accomplish these goals. However, this NAFTA does not provide meaningful assurances that these goals can be accomplished. Therefore, I will oppose this NAFTA and work toward developing a better approach to meeting these goals.

It is imperative that we do not pass a flawed NAFTA because once Congress goes down this path, we set the standard for future free-trade agreements which will certainly be forthcoming. Most importantly, this NAFTA would lock the United States into a long-term agreement that would affect generations of Americans. The stakes are very high due to the fact that this agreement threatens American businesses' ability to provide family-supporting jobs for Americans. It has been a strong domestic economy which has propelled this Nation to be the leader of world economic growth since World War II.

This will undoubtedly be one of the most important votes I cast in this Congress.

As occurs with any important vote, I have been heavily lobbied by both the proponents and opponents of NAFTA, and have received at least 1,000 letters, postcards, and calls from my constituents. Given the gravity of this vote, I have spent many hours discussing and studying detailed summaries and analyses of the NAFTA text, the side agreements, as well as papers on issues related to NAFTA.

My final consideration on this issue came with a response to a letter I wrote to Trade Ambassador Mickey Kantor, in which I outlined my concerns and summarized many of the issues that the people of Wisconsin have relayed to me. These points include the impact of NAFTA on American businesses and workers, on the environment, on States' rights, and the costs of implementing the agreement.

I have thoroughly reviewed Mr. Kantor's response, and believe that the administration still has not accomplished the goals that had been set when the side agreement negotiations began.

There are three fundamental problems with this NAFTA which were not adequately addressed through the side agreements, problems that lead me to believe that this NAFTA is not in the best interest of our country.

First, the NAFTA was not negotiated on the most favorable terms to the United States. One of the problems is that current policies governing trade between Mexico and the United States are so badly slanted against this country. Mexican tariffs on United States goods are in many cases two or three times—and in some cases eight times—higher than United States tariffs on Mexican goods. NAFTA does not eliminate this imbalance in a timely manner.

For example, the Mexican tariff on United States automobiles, which is currently at 20 percent, will only be completely removed by the year 2009. The U.S. tariff, currently at a low rate of 2.5 percent, is eliminated immediately. That means that United States automobile manufacturers will have to wait for 15 years to gain comparable access to the Mexican market.

The Mexican trucking industry currently has access to border States without having to comply fully with United States regulations governing transportation. The United States trucking industry currently has very limited access to the Mexican market. NAFTA would increase this access for the U.S. trucking industry, but only over the course of many years.

Furthermore, the benefits of opening the Mexican market over time will not likely accrue to Wisconsin dairy farmers. If there are any gains to be made by the dairy industry by opening the Mexican market, it is in the Southwest United States. Dairy prices for farmers in Wisconsin are not likely to be significantly boosted, but NAFTA could reignite consumer fears regarding food safety in the United States which could ultimately hurt our farmers. Mexican agriculture uses at least 17 different pesticides that are banned in the United States, according to the General Accounting Office.

Our record in negotiating trade agreements since 1974 has been less than positive—it approaches being abysmal. The cumulative trade deficit since 1974 is more than \$1 trillion. Any gains the United States has made into foreign markets have come at a substantial cost.

The second fundamental problem with this NAFTA is that most of the benefits for our country will not accrue for a number of years, and then only if there is a growing standard of living for Mexican workers in order to provide them with more purchasing power to buy American goods.

There is also the question of the outflow of investment and capital that has not been fully considered in this debate, which could mitigate any tariff advantages that the United States may gain. Because of investment shifts as a result of this NAFTA, several economists including Donald Ratajczak of Georgia State University, conclude that NAFTA would displace \$2.5 billion of investment from the United States to Mexico annually, which could

mean 375,000 potential new jobs lost over 5 years.

Through the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement, we have already created one of the largest and most competitive free trade zones in the world. Adding Mexico to this equation will only add approximately 5 percent to the size of this free trade zone. However, it is the promise of 90 million Mexican consumers whose purchasing power is increased substantially that would provide the greatest benefits to the United States. However, that is not likely to occur under the terms of this NAFTA.

Wages and purchasing power generally increase with productivity in the industrialized world. In Mexico, gains in productivity have not been accompanied by the expected gains in wages. Productivity in Mexico has risen by more than 30 percent in real terms since 1980. But real wages have declined by 32 percent over the same period. While some progress on wages has been made in Mexico over the last few years, the minimum wage in Mexico still stands at 58 cents per hour. The Mexican Government continues to monopolize business associations and labor organizations, thereby commanding the economy and its workers in a manner that could work to a significant competitive disadvantage for the United States over the long term.

The third fundamental problem with NAFTA is that the side agreements lack real enforcement mechanisms to ensure the enforcement of national environmental and labor laws, which is the stated goal of the side agreements.

The side agreements do not allow for trade sanctions to be imposed if Mexico does not enforce its domestic labor laws with regard to the right of Mexican workers to seek better wages through the right to strike or collectively bargain.

The side agreements do not ensure a growing wage and added purchasing power for Mexican workers, nor do they adequately address more than one of the six major environmental issues that have been raised.

The likelihood that trade sanctions will ever be implemented is very low. The General Accounting Office prepared a report that indicated that Mexico lacks the staff, funds, and systems to fully identify new companies, much less enforce their laws. Furthermore, the process established through the side agreements for sanctioning the failure to enforce domestic laws related to trade, the environment and competitiveness is overly bureaucratic—even the proponents of NAFTA acknowledge that the process is not really workable.

Businesses in the United States need somewhat of a level playing field to compete in the global market, including Mexico. But the side agreements do not bring us closer to that goal. Without adequate enforcement mechanisms in Mexico, over time the problems that currently exist in our trade relationship will grow worse.

In addition to these three fundamental problems with this NAFTA text itself, I have further concerns about how the agreement could affect our country.

NAFTA will serve as a dangerous pattern for negotiating trade agreements with other Latin American nations. Chile and the Carib-

bean nations are already waiting in line to gain the benefits of NAFTA. I am concerned that unless we negotiate the best possible terms under this NAFTA, we will end up creating a precedent that will be repeated again and again.

Also, and equally important is attempting to finance the costs of implementing NAFTA, especially when the priority at the Federal level has been reducing the budget deficit. The administration must find a minimum of \$2.5 billion in revenues or spending cuts up front to pay for the lower tariff revenues as a result of NAFTA and a bare bones worker retraining program. The total costs of NAFTA could exceed \$30 billion, with funds earmarked for border cleanup and development and dislocated worker retraining. Regrettably, the proposal to raise more than \$1 billion through increasing international airline passenger fees by 20 percent is not even directly related to NAFTA. There are not too many other revenue sources to finance NAFTA without hindering deficit reduction efforts.

Furthermore, this NAFTA comes at a time when our economy is still fragile. It would contribute to the loss of several hundred thousand American jobs based on credible estimates, with millions of related jobs made vulnerable. Our manufacturing jobs support a large number of related jobs in the community. That's why we can ill-afford to further erode our job-supporting manufacturing base.

Workers who lose their jobs as a consequence of NAFTA may find help for retraining, but what jobs will they be retrained for?

Experience with dislocated workers shows that they tend to move down—rather than up—the economic ladder to lower-wage jobs. A Congressional Budget Office report concludes that for every 100 U.S. workers who lost their jobs in the 1980's at least 61 had not attained the same standard of living they had in their previous employment. A trade agreement should contribute to enabling U.S. business to create more family-supporting jobs in this country, however, this NAFTA may end up costing more business than it creates.

Rejecting this NAFTA does not mean that we turn our backs on Mexico. It means we begin negotiating a better agreement—one that will help American workers and businesses and also one that will help Mexico. I will encourage my colleagues to call on President Clinton to renegotiate the NAFTA with the new Canadian Government and with President Salinas or his democratically elected successor in Mexico.

We must avoid repeating the same mistakes that we made in negotiating this NAFTA.

We should examine what the European Community did to integrate the economies and lower tariffs among its member nations. Since World War II, Europe has been gradually integrating its economies but has put in safeguards to ensure that the integration results in higher standards of living in all the member nations. For instance, Portugal, Greece, and Spain, which had average wages around one-third the level of average wages in the industrialized countries of France, Germany, and Great Britain, were allowed to join the EC only after they initiated reasonable political and economic reforms.

This year alone the EC will spend almost \$25 billion on transition needs. Since 1986 Europe has spent more than \$120 billion on integration. This has been the cost of constructing free trade with countries in which the standard of living is much closer than the differences between the United States and Mexico. It has taken many years and hundreds of billions of dollars to integrate relatively similar economies in Europe.

The North American Free-Trade Agreement also comes with a cost. The people of the United States must decide what level of commitment is necessary to attain similar economic integration to that of the European Common Market. Can we expect Mexico and the United States—with widely differing economies—to integrate literally on January 1 without any real commitment to dealing with the costs associated with this agreement?

That's why my decision will probably not be a big surprise because I stated throughout my campaign that I was opposed to the NAFTA as previously negotiated and was skeptical that the side agreements would adequately address the aforementioned concerns. Furthermore, I believe that very few Members of Congress who take the time to read the side agreements would believe this NAFTA accomplishes all the goals for which they were intended.

A vote against this NAFTA should not be interpreted as a vote to reject increased trade with Mexico and Canada. We already have a free-trade agreement with Canada which I publicly supported as a member of the State legislature. I strongly support free and fair trade, especially among industrialized countries and with the further goal of increasing trade throughout the Americas.

I feel it is important to point out that the issue is not between business and labor as many would lead us to believe, rather, it is an issue of ensuring the manufacturing base, which enables us to create jobs that provide our present standard of living in this country, has somewhat of a level playing field in the future.

We can do better than this NAFTA. To those that say that opposing the present agreement will simply leave us with the status quo, I say that the status quo is completely unacceptable but that this NAFTA does not adequately improve it. Mexico wants and needs a trade agreement, President Clinton possesses the skills to negotiate a more favorable agreement to our interests, and the new Government in Canada has indicated an interest in forging ahead with a renegotiated agreement.

That is the course that I hope we will follow. The first step is to set aside this NAFTA. So I will be voting "no" when this NAFTA is presented to Congress and calling for an agreement that adequately addresses the concerns of the people of Wisconsin and accomplishes the goals of free and fair trade.

NAFTA

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1993

Ms. FURSE, Mr. Speaker, the following article is for Members' information and provides compelling material on the NAFTA agreement written by William Greider and published in the October 28 issue of Rolling Stone magazine.

[From the Rolling Stone, Oct. 28, 1993]

CONGRESS: KILL NAFTA

[By William Greider]

Facing a civil war within its own party ranks, the White House is peddling a fatalistic argument on behalf of NAFTA, the proposed free-trade agreement with Mexico and Canada. Congress might as well go ahead and ratify the treaty, according to the administration's informal sales pitch, because the economic trends won't be altered much in any case. Even if NAFTA loses, American factories and jobs will still keep moving to Mexico or to other low-wage nations around the world. The reality of global economic integration can't be repealed by Congress any more than King Canute could command the tides.

This line of argument is a familiar sophistry in Washington legislative debates, one usually advanced by the side that fears it's losing. In technical terms, NAFTA would simply phase out most U.S. tariffs on Mexican goods and relax various restrictions that Mexico imposes on American producers. The substantive impact, however, would be enormous. In effect, the trade preferences that created the maquiladora zone, where thousands of U.S. plants have located just inside the Mexican border, would be extended to cover the entire country. Anyone who has seen the rank pollution, labor exploitation and industrial slums of the maquiladoras understands why environmentalists, American labor unions and human-rights activists oppose NAFTA. Having seen this brutal scene for myself, I can't get it out of my mind. I've asked many NAFTA supporters why we should not expect the same exploitation to be spread across all of Mexico if NAFTA is adopted, and none of them have given me a good answer.

The White House's defensiveness begs an obvious question: If NAFTA really won't change much, why are the Fortune 500 companies, the National Association of Manufacturers and the army of lobbyists hired by the Mexican government working so hard for its passage? The question almost answers itself.

Actually, the best argument for adopting NAFTA is a cynical view of global Realpolitik that's widely shared among policy-makers but awkward for administration officials to enunciate because it contradicts their free-trade rhetoric. It goes like this: The industrial world is dividing up into potentially hostile regional trading blocs, and the United States needs to organize its own hemisphere in self-defense against the European Economic Community and the Pacific Rim economies tied to Japan. The widespread fear is that the global trading system is producing so much social and economic strain in so many countries, including the United States, that it is threatened with breakdown. The new trading blocs are promoted in the name of tariff reduction, but it is suspected they will sooner or later be employed for protectionist purposes.

Toward that end, NAFTA has much larger implications than the current debate sug-

gests. Three other trade alliances are already forming in the Western Hemisphere—Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay; the Andean Pact nations; and Central America—and NAFTA includes a clause for rapidly including these other groups in one huge all-American freetrade zone. Thus, if Congress approves NAFTA, the general rules will be set for integrating a dauntingly diverse collection of rich and poor societies, even more different than the economies of Canada, the United States and Mexico. No one in the world has ever attempted something like this before, much less succeeded.

That might be the best argument for defeating the treaty: It's too much to swallow in one gulp and illdesigned to cope with the consequences. The Clinton administration, like the Bush administration before it, has utterly failed to develop a plausible set of rules for bridging the vast social and economic gulf between countries as different as Mexico and the U.S. The nations of Western Europe have devoted nearly 40 years to working out the complex guarantees required for economic union, but the proposition is still mired in controversy and public resistance. It may or may not go forward. Yet European union would integrate national economies with much smaller disparities in wages, working conditions and economic development.

American negotiators tried to solve a much larger problem in a couple of months. The wage gap between Germany and Portugal is about 3-to-1, while the gap between the U.S. and Mexico is at least 8-to-1. The European Community developed "social charter" provisions designed to ensure that low-wage workers in the poorer countries would not be exploited by runaway industries and that, over time, the bottom could be pulled up. Aside from rhetorical flourishes, NAFTA is a system designed to pull the top down. The flight of American factories—and the threat of flight—would apply permanent downward pressure on American industrial wages.

In that sense, the free-trade treaty is a missed opportunity—for both supporters and critics—because it could have been a chance to generate real change in the global economy. The administration is right about the global economy—it's an irreversible force—but NAFTA could have provided the model for a third way between free trade and old-style protectionism: new trade rules that begin to reconcile the gross difference between the haves and the have-nots. A reformed global economy would impose trading rules on nations and multi-national corporations that pull the bottom up—by guaranteeing workers the right to organize in their own behalf, by requiring that wages be tied to rising productivity, by penalizing exports that violate the basic human rights of modern societies. The Clinton administration talked about doing this when it negotiated new side agreements this summer on labor rights and environmental protection, but, in the end, it ducked the hard questions and settled for empty words.

As it stands now, the main contribution of NAFTA, win or lose, will be the way the issue has opened many people's eyes to the larger dimensions of the global economic problem: The prosperity of the haves is now tied inextricably to the fate of the have-nots. The future well-being of Ohio or Illinois may be decided ultimately by what happens to workers in places like Cuautitlán or Puebla.

Since he was elected President of debt-burdened Mexico in 1988, Carlos Salinas de Gortari has been justly celebrated in the

world financial markets as a great reformer. Salinas swiftly opened the protectionist and largely state-owned Mexican economy to the world. He deregulated and decentralized and sold huge chunks of Mexican enterprises to private investors. He codified investment protections, stabilized the peso and invited foreign capital to finance a vast industrial modernization. The Bolsa de Valores, Mexico's stock market, entered a giddy boom as American investment houses sent mucho dollars.

But there is one other "reform" that the Wall Street cheerleaders seldom mention: Salinas also smashed labor. Across key industrial sectors, from oil to autos, from beer to mining, the Salinas government crushed unions pushing for higher wages and smothered workers who tried to form their own independent trade unions. Numerous uprisings of workers were thwarted by Mexico's byzantine labor laws, designed to give the ruling political party full control. When the law proved insufficient, the workers were put down by organized violence—bloody attacks by the police or labor goons that resembled American labor conflicts of a half century ago.

At the Volkswagen plant in Puebla, the company unilaterally reduced wages and benefits and changed work rules in the summer of 1992. When the workers went on strike, the company fired the entire work force of 14,000, then imposed the new contract and rehired all but those who refused to accept the lower wages. VW "almost certainly acted with the tacit approval of the government," the Financial Times reported. A meeting of 8,000 VW workers voted unanimously to remove their union head, claiming he had been bribed with a payment of \$160,000. Government regulators refused to accept the decision.

At Ford's plant in Cuautitlán, where Mercury Cougars are assembled, long-running conflicts between workers and the company led to bloody confrontations in early 1990. A group of 30 thugs, many reported to be out-of-uniform police officers, attacked and beat several local leaders. Six workers were either kidnapped or arrested, then released. Three days later, workers found 200 or 300 armed men inside the plant. In the battle that ensued, 12 workers were wounded by gunfire. One later died. The police did not appear.

The workers claimed the goons were from CTM, the national labor federation that is closely allied with Salinas and the PRI, the political party that has held uninterrupted power in Mexico since the 1920s. CTM helps the government and the companies enforce labor peace. Ford won a ruling that the workers' action was illegal and fired 2,300 workers. By government edict, the rebellious labor leaders were subsequently replaced with new leaders loyal to the PRI. Ford expressed regret at the violence in its factory and disclaimed any responsibility.

These facts are drawn from official protest petitions filed by the International Labor Rights Education and Research Fund (ILRERF) and from Dan La Botz's chilling book on labor suppression in Mexico, *Mask of Democracy*. Such episodes have been commonplace in the Salinas years at both domestic and foreign-owned industries.

When Salinas staged an early showdown with the powerful Petroleum Workers Union in early 1989, it ended with police and military troops raiding the union boss's home and arresting him. A bazooka rocket launcher was used to blow the door off his house. Between 3,000 and 5,000 soldiers of the Mexi-

can army seized the Cananea copper mine to break a labor protest there. A 1990 strike at the Modelo Brewery in Mexico City (where Corona beer is made) led to beatings by riot police and firefighters. When workers tried to change their union affiliation at Tornel Rubber Company, some protest leaders were kidnapped, and workers were attacked and beaten by goons wearing CTM shirts. The victims filed complaints with Salinas' new Commission on Human Rights, but mass firings and physical intimidation continued.

This pattern of labor suppression has an obvious purpose. "The Salinas administration is grabbing control of the workers' lives in a way different from any of its predecessors," La Botz reported. "The difference . . . is in the government's attitude toward foreign capital and its willingness to destroy or suppress organized labor for the sake of currying favor with foreign capital."

Salinas' labor strategy is directly connected to NAFTA, according to the international labor-rights fund. "The prospect of NAFTA has led the Mexican government to implement a more restrictive labor policy to attract foreign investment, offering in return political stability, domesticated trade unions, easy labor regulations and, especially, low wages," the ILRERF complained to the U.S. trade representative.

Aside from the moral implications, why should Americans care? Because the promised benefits of free trade with Mexico will never materialize as long as Mexican labor is denied the ability to organize and bargain collectively for higher wages. The textbook economic theory holds that unfettered trade will benefit Americans, even if many U.S. factories and jobs migrate to Mexico, because new consumer demand will be created in Mexico to buy other American goods. But industrial workers who earn \$2.35 an hour on average cannot even buy the products they are making themselves, much less buy imported goods from the United States.

This is an unfashionable argument, I know, but the enduring truth about industrial societies is that strong unions, pushing wage rates upward, are a necessary ingredient for widely shared prosperity. As organized labor has atrophied in the U.S., and American wages have declined over the last 20 years, the effects have been felt by both union and non-union workers. Ultimately, prosperity in the global economy will require workers to organize in newly developing countries and across national boundaries, both to defend themselves from exploitation and to promote economic equity for everyone.

Rep. George E. Brown of California is among those who have pointed out this connection to the president. "Linking trade to respect for basic labor rights and standards is a crucial ingredient for boosting global purchasing power," Brown told Clinton in a letter earlier this year. Richard Rothstein of the Economic Policy Institute explained: "An international competitive environment based on low wages acts as a permanent brake on income growth in developing nations and denies American exporters the consumer markets which growth of industrial working classes in developing nations would otherwise bring."

Despite rhetorical promises, the new side agreements negotiated by the Clinton administration fail to confront this. The labor agreement provides a tortuous five-step mechanism for dealing with complaints about child-labor abuses, health-and-safety problems and minimum-wage violations—procedures so mushy it will take years before anything happens. "If there is a child-

labor case, the kid is going to reach retirement age before any action is taken," says Bill Goold, a congressional trade expert.

But more important, the agreement dodges the central question of labor rights and industrial relations—freedom of association. If Mexican workers are not able to form their own independent unions, free of the PRI's political manipulation and the government's use of force, they are not much better off than the Polish workers who founded Solidarity in the 1970s to escape control of the Communist Party unions in Poland.

The exclusion of labor rights was not an accident—Mexico insisted on it, and the U.S. negotiators did not press the point. Commerce Minister Jaime Serra Puche, Mexico's lead negotiator, reportedly told one meeting of North American Free Trade Agreement negotiators, "There will be no sunshine on industrial relations." Given the complexities of the complaint procedures, Serra Puche has publicly reassured business interests: "The time frame of the process makes it very improbable that the stage of sanctions could be reached."

Jerome I. Levinson, former general counsel to the Inter-American Development Bank, has analyzed the labor agreement and concluded: "By taking the violation of these rights, no matter how persistent they may be, out of the jurisdiction of the grievance procedure, the Clinton administration has implicitly endorsed the abuses inherent in the Mexican labor-relations system."

Furthermore, notwithstanding Clinton's recent claims, the agreement contains nothing to ensure that Mexico's pitiful wage level will rise in step with increased productivity. Thus, multinational corporations (Japanese and European as well as American) can use Mexico as a cheap-labor export platform for reaching the American market duty-free. Levinson noted that Mexican productivity rose by 41 percent between 1980 and 1992—yet wages and benefits fell by more than 30 percent over those years.

"To maintain this low-wage, high-productivity policy," Levinson wrote, "the Mexican government has made it virtually impossible to organize trade unions independent of its control."

Why did the Clinton administration cave in? Partly because it was under intense counterpressure from American business interests not to do anything to encourage labor reform in Mexico. Partly because it did not want to disrupt its own diplomacy by interfering with the domestic political control of Mexico's one-party state. Partly, perhaps, because the Clinton team is itself ambivalent about the role of organized labor in fostering economic prosperity through rising wages and consumer demand.

Labor Secretary Robert Reich, who is busy promoting new schemes for cooperative relations in offices and factories, recently told the New York Times, "The jury is still out on whether the traditional union is necessary for the new workplace." Commerce Secretary Ron Brown was also lukewarm. "Unions are OK where they are," Brown said. "And where they are not, it is not clear yet what sort of organization should represent workers."

There is one other good reason why neither the United States government nor American companies wish to introduce the subject of internationally recognized labor standards into the terms of trade. Sooner or later, that would come back to haunt them. Canadians and Mexicans could find much to criticize in America's own system of labor regulation—laws that also blunt the ability of workers to organize for collective bargaining.

November 16, 1993

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

29535

Win or lose, NAFTA is only the first round in what promises to be a long and historic fight over this question. It won't go away because, just as the White House says, economic integration is proceeding everywhere, bringing low-wage nations into global production but giving workers little or no means to demand a fair share of the rewards. If not this time, the trade debate will return again and again to the economic dilemma

that low-wage exploitation produces for the world: too many goods chasing too few consumers with not enough money to buy them. The first step to genuine reform is to kill NAFTA now. Then President Clinton should start over again, negotiating new trading rules, not just for Mexico and Latin America but for the global system at large.

"The Clinton administration could have done something truly historic in writing new

trade agreements and they blew it," says Goold. "But NAFTA is the first awakening for many people. The way we talk about investment and trade and foreign economic assistance doesn't match the reality out there. The multinational corporations understand this. The governments don't. At least our government doesn't."