

responsibility, community involvement, and family.

The city of St. Louis recently celebrated Mark McGwire's decision to sign a long-term contract to remain a Cardinal. McGwire demonstrated his generosity and commitment to the St. Louis community by pledging to donate \$1 million of his salary every year to his foundation for sexually and physically abused children. Mark McGwire's baseball statistics show his excellence on the baseball field but his decision to give \$1 million of his salary demonstrates what makes up his character.

I'm proud to be a St. Louis Cardinals fan—the greatest fans in all of baseball. Mark McGwire is the best home run hitter in the game today and someone in which the entire city can take pride. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mark McGwire on his outstanding baseball achievements and his decision to stay in St. Louis. I join the entire city in welcoming Mark McGwire and I look forward to admiring his work—both on and off the field—in the years to come.

A BILL TO END THE U.S. TRADE DEFICIT

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, trade deficits matter. They represent millions of lost jobs—mostly in high wage manufacturing industries. They help keep U.S. interest rates at abnormally high levels, depressing economic growth. And large, persistent trade deficits with low wage nations inevitably depress wages in the United States and contribute to one of America's most vexing problems: the growing disparities in the wealth and incomes of our citizens.

The United States has not had a positive trade balance since 1975. The 1996 total trade deficit—including services—was \$111 billion. The merchandise-only trade deficit was \$192 billion—a new record. It's true that exports create jobs. But when imports—especially imports of goods that were once produced in U.S. factories—exceed exports by nearly \$200 billion a year, the result is a net loss of some of the best jobs our economy has to offer. That's exactly what this Nation's trade policies have delivered to the American people.

Today I am introducing a bill to establish the emergency commission to end the trade deficit. My bill would establish a commission to develop a comprehensive trade policy plan by examining the economic policies, trade, tax, investment laws, and other legal incentives and restrictions that are relevant to reducing the U.S. trade deficit. The commission would be composed of members with expertise in economics, international trade, manufacturing, labor, environment, and business. Senators DORGAN and BYRD have introduced companion legislation in the Senate.

Trade policy developed on a fast track has been disastrous for our people and our economy. It is time to slow down and carefully develop a trade policy whose principle objective is the generation of decent jobs and rising wages for the majority of our people.

TRIBUTE TO DALLAS LIGHTHOUSE FOR THE BLIND

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a great American and a great organization. The Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind has a long history in Dallas of providing blind individuals with work opportunities. The six decades of work improve and enhance the job opportunities for sight-disabled Dallas residents. I am proud to have this modern industrial center in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

This year the fifth district has been doubly blessed. One of my constituents, Jeddie Alexander, has been named the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind's Ronald Pearce Blind Employee of the Year. Jeddie is a machine operator in the molding department of the lighthouse. In addition, he helped produce eyeglass cases and binders. Jeddie is completely blind, but his uncommon ability has allowed him to run a sewing machine.

Jeddie's story vividly shows that we should focus on abilities, not disabilities. In 1985, Jeddie was shot. He lost the use of both eyes and has no light perception. As he recounts, "When I lost my sight, I had the impression that that was the end of myself. I would have to wait on other people to do things for me. After about a month and a half, I realized I didn't have to do that."

I applaud Jeddie's commitment to improving his life and the lives of the people around him. He has truly taken advantage of the opportunities the Lighthouse has given him. As a father of a young Down's syndrome boy, I understand the desperate need for organizations like the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind. Organizations like this give the greatest gift in all of the world—freedom, independence, and self-reliance to individuals that need an extra boost on the road of life.

WHY I SUPPORT "FAST TRACK"

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, many people have diverse opinions on the issue of fast track and its potential impact in a wide range of areas. I wanted to take this opportunity to define fast track and explain what it is intended to do and what it is not designed to do.

Fast track is simply the process by which Congress provides limited authority to the President to enter into more trade negotiations in order to lower barriers to our U.S. exports. All fast track does is allow the President the ability to negotiate these trade agreements and then present the agreement to Congress for a final "yes" or "no" vote on the entire package without adding or taking away specific words or sections from the agreement. During the negotiations and the drafting of the final agreement, fast track mandates that there is sufficient consultation with Congress so that the President will not present an agreement that does not have the support of a majority in

Congress. That, simply, is fast track, nothing more, nothing less.

Fast track is not a new concept. It has been a common practice for over 60 years, in some form, for every President since Franklin Roosevelt as tariffs became less and less a source of revenue for the U.S. Government and foreign trade policy grew in complexity and importance to the U.S. economy. The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 was the first time Congress delegated to the President the broad authority to set, within specific limits and for a limited time, tariff and other foreign trade policy.

Up until 1945, 32 bilateral tariff-reducing agreements were reached. In 1947, the United States became a founding member of the multilateral General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], whose aim is a mutual reduction of barriers to trade among all the free market nations of the world. During this time, Congress extended the 1934 act 11 times to open up more markets to U.S. products by lowering tariffs.

Then, in 1962, Congress gave President Kennedy a 5-year authority to participate in the first major GATT round or negotiation to not just lower tariffs but eliminate duties on specific products. These global trade talks became more commonly known as the Kennedy round, named after his untimely death.

The Kennedy round concluded in 1967 when agreements were reached to reduce not only tariffs but, for the first time, non-tariff or redtape barriers. But more controversial, the executive branch, under President Johnson, also negotiated an international antidumping agreement that was not contained within the authority Congress originally gave President Kennedy. Congress subsequently enacted a law in 1968 nullifying any provision of this antidumping agreement that was not consistent with U.S. law.

Because of this dispute between the executive and legislative branch, a compromise was reached after a 7-year period when there were no significant global trade barrier reduction negotiations. Thus, the fast track procedures were formally adopted for the first time as part of the Trade Act of 1974. This legislation granted then President Ford another 5-year time period to negotiate a further reduction in trade barriers. These talks became more commonly known as the Tokyo round of the GATT. This round eventually produced a package of 14 international trade agreements that eventually became part of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, negotiated by President Carter.

As part of this renewed fast-track authority, the executive branch agreed to more closely consult with Congress, even to the point of accrediting 10 Members of Congress to serve as advisors to trade negotiating teams. But, in return, Congress agreed not to amend or change the final agreement. Countries will not negotiate with the United States until they are assured that the final agreement will not be changed. However, the legislative branch established an informal process with the executive branch, from the beginning of the negotiating process to crafting the implementing legislation, that the final agreement reflects the will of a majority of Congress.

Fast track was further extended again to President Reagan as part of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984. Thus, the U.S.-Israel Free

Trade Agreement in 1985 and the U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement in 1988 was negotiated and enacted into law under this authority.

Fast track was extended again to President Reagan as part of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988. This authority allowed him and, subsequently Presidents Bush and Clinton to negotiate and enact the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] in 1993 and the third major GATT agreement, otherwise known as the Uruguay round, in 1994.

Thus, President Clinton's fast-track proposal is nothing new. It has been used by 11 Presidents of both political parties for over the last 60 years. The previous fast-track authority expired in 1994. In the specific proposal before Congress, the President would be given until 2001, which can be extended until 2005 unless one House of Congress disapproves, the ability to negotiate further reductions to trade barriers around the world.

Once again, fast track does not take any power away from Congress. In fact, this procedure requires constant congressional review and input throughout each stage of the process from deciding which country to negotiate with to proposing the final legislative bill to implement the agreement. No President will submit a trade agreement that has not been thoroughly analyzed and supported by a majority in Congress. Without fast track, we would never have any more major agreements.

That's why I support providing any President, regardless of party affiliation, the ability to enter into comprehensive trade agreements to help boost our exports as long as the negotiations stick closely to resolving trade problems, not unrelated issues. Most observers believe Chile would be the next logical candidate to enter a free-trade agreement with the United States.

A free-trade agreement with Chile will be very beneficial to the United States. The average tariff or tax on United States exports to Chile is 11 percent. Yet, the average tariff rate for Chilean imports into the United States is less than 1 percent. Essentially, Chile already has a one-sided free-trade zone with the United States. Obviously, a free-trade agreement with zero tariffs on both sides is of greater benefit to the United States.

Chile has already entered into a variety of free-trade agreements with other nations, such as Canada and Mexico. There are documented cases when U.S. workers lost approximately \$500 million in export opportunities in 1996 to foreign competitors because the U.S. product had an 11-percent tax added on top of the base price. For example, workers at a major United States telecommunications firm lost the opportunity to help rebuild Chile's phone system to Northern Telecom of Canada because of the lack of a free-trade agreement with the United States. With fast-track authority, we can knock down these trade barriers, not just with Chile but with other countries and in specific sectors such as agriculture, automobiles, and environmental technology to help United States workers make products that will be sold abroad.

I understand that many oppose fast track because they sincerely believe that this vote serves as a referendum on the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA]. Many opponents of fast track believe that NAFTA has cost the United States hundreds of thou-

sands of jobs. First, the analysis is based on a false assumption that any trade deficit automatically translates into job loss. In some cases, imports create job opportunities here at home, from longshoremen to clerks in retail stores. In other cases, goods are imported into the United States for final assembly for consumption here or exported abroad. Thus, no one should assume that because there is a trade deficit with a certain country, then that automatically translates into U.S. job loss. If that were the case, then oil producing countries like Saudi Arabia and Venezuela would be the greatest displacer of United States jobs because oil imports comprise most of our global trade deficit.

In the specific case of Mexico, it is important to remember that NAFTA actually prevented a bad situation from turning worse. United States exports to Mexico suffered a decline in 1995 because of the peso devaluation and the ensuing economic downturn, which had nothing to do with NAFTA.

A less serious economic crisis affected Mexico during the early 1980's but the impact on United States exports was much greater than 1995. Mexico's economic growth rate dropped by a significant 7 percent in 1995 as compared to a growth rate decrease of 0.6 percent in 1982 and 4.2 percent in 1983. United States exports to Mexico dropped by 35 percent in 1982 and 24 percent in 1983. However, in 1995, United States exports to Mexico decreased by only 13 percent. Why? Because Mexico honored the tariff reduction commitments it made in 1993 as part of NAFTA.

In 1982, Mexico responded to its economic downturn by raising tariffs and other import barriers against United States products to protect their industries. But in 1995, while Mexico significantly raised tariffs and trade barriers against other nations not part of NAFTA such as Europe and Japan, Mexico did not do so against the United States and Canada because that action would have violated NAFTA. Thus, while United States exports to Mexico dropped off by half in the early 1980's, they only decreased by 13 percent in 1995 during a much more severe economic crisis thanks to legal protections contained in NAFTA. In other words, whatever United States job loss can be associated with trade with Mexico after NAFTA would have been much greater in 1995 if NAFTA was not in place. Thus, NAFTA prevented the loss of more United States jobs because under the terms of NAFTA, Mexico was prohibited from raising tariffs and more red-tape regulations to restrict U.S. exports.

While many northern Illinois exporters faced a rocky road with Mexico in 1995, prospects now look brighter. I see news headlines such as: "Midwest Boom Fueled by Mexico Trade," "Spurred by NAFTA, Illinois Exports Finally Rebound," and "NAFTA's Impact on Jobs Has Been Slight, Study Says." I have heard from many companies in the 16th District of Illinois whose workers have specifically benefited because of the increased openness in Mexico thanks to NAFTA. For example, Eclipse Corp. closed up their factory in Mexico and relocated operations back to Rockford because NAFTA now allows their product to be shipped much more easily into Mexico.

But regardless of anyone's position on NAFTA, opposing fast track will not do anything to solve any remaining trade problems the United States has with Mexico. To defeat

fast track will not stop United States companies from moving their factories to Mexico or slow down Mexican imports into the United States. It is very important to remember this because many who oppose fast track sincerely believe defeating this initiative will stop these practices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I support fast track as one tool in our trade arsenal to help lower barriers around the world to U.S. exports. I have been fighting to make sure that our trade policy has all tools at its disposal, from antidumping laws, which helped Brake Parts of McHenry keep 400 jobs by fighting off unfair competition from unscrupulous Chinese brake rotor manufacturers, to the Export-Import Bank of the United States, which allowed Beloit Corp. with a manufacturing facility in Rockton, IL, keep 2,000 union workers employed along the Wisconsin-Illinois stateline border by providing a major loan to help sell two large, fine papermaking machines to Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, fast track is simply another method to help break down trade barriers so that workers and farmers in the 16th District of Illinois can continue to build and grow products that will be shipped around the world. We cannot rest on our laurels during these good economic times, which have been caused, to a large degree, by the growth in U.S. exports, as we enter the next millennium. We need continued, further progress on the global elimination of barriers to U.S. exports. There is much more work that needs to be done. That's why we need fast track.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS
EDWARD J. KURTZ

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to rise before you today to pay tribute to an individual who exemplifies the very best in civic pride and responsibility. On Tuesday, October 14, the Flint, MI, area Chamber of Commerce will honor Dr. Edward J. Kurtz with their Charles Stewart Mott Citizen of the Year Award.

Dr. Kurtz's name has become synonymous with education. In 1968, Dr. Kurtz introduced himself to Baker college as a student. Little did he know that this was the beginning of a relationship that would span over 30 years. Upon completing courses at Baker, Dr. Kurtz continued his education, receiving his bachelor of science degree at Ferris State University in 1968. He then returned to Baker where he worked as an instructor and later served as executive director of the school until 1974. Dr. Kurtz was then named president and chief executive officer of Baker College System, a position he maintains to this day. While serving as president, Dr. Kurtz managed to find the time to obtain his master's degree from Eastern Michigan University in 1974 and his doctorate from Tiffin University in Ohio in 1987.

Because Dr. Kurtz has experience in all aspects of the educational arena at Baker, Dr. Kurtz provides a pleasing sense of familiarity and empathy for the students, staff, and faculty under his care. Due to Dr. Kurtz's leadership, Baker College System has set a new