

between the Senate and House of Representatives conference committee. These fees, in many cases, will be the largest fees in history and will be windfalls for these attorneys. These moneys would be better spent on health care for children.

Second, an education provision, which I strongly supported, authored by my good friend from Washington, Senator SLADE GORTON, was also stripped during the House-Senate conference negotiations. This amendment would have required the Secretary of Education to award certain funds appropriated for the Department of Education for kindergarten through grade 12 programs and activities directly to the local education agencies. This will allow them to use the funds for their greatest needs and reduce paperwork. I supported this amendment because I believe it is time to take control of our schools out of the hands of the well-intentioned individuals in Washington and instead put the control into the hands of the real experts—the teachers, principals, parents and the students of Alabama. Mr. President, this is another example of Government putting Washington values ahead of Alabama's values. The fundamental question is this: Will our children benefit more if Washington is in charge of their education or if their elected representatives are? Alabama values would support the local control of our schools while Washington values support the bureaucratic heavy handed federal control of our education system.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say plainly I support many of the programs and services found in this bill. It was my sincere hope to have been counted among its supporters on the Senate floor. However in this era when families are struggling to get by, we simply must begin the process of controlling the growth of Washington spending. That is why I have decided to vote "no."•

#### FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY

• Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a matter of utmost importance to our Nation—granting the President fast-track authority for global trade agreements for the next 5 years.

I have long opposed extending fast-track authority to the executive branch on the grounds that it removes all possibility of perfecting trade agreements which have wide-ranging impacts on many sectors of our economy. And nothing I have seen in recent history has changed my mind.

We are being asked to rubber stamp not just one agreement, but any trade agreement that may come along, whether in South America, Asia, or anywhere else in the world. We are contemplating letting bureaucrats and other unelected interests negotiate America's future in the new global economy. And if history is any indication, we would be making a grievous mistake.

Experience is a wonderful teacher—just look at NAFTA. What I have learned is that NAFTA has not been the job boon it was advertised to be; that the trade deficit has continued to explode under NAFTA, that too many good paying jobs have already been sacrificed on the altar of so-called fair trade, and that we have serious difficulties in enforcing the agreements we've already made.

That is not a particularly encouraging track record—certainly not one that should inspire us to hand over the trade agreement keys to the White House. To the contrary, it raises grave concerns as to where the administration wants to take the country in the new world of globalization.

That is why I believe the President is obliged to do more than just say that he needs fast-track authority. The gap between what he said would happen under NAFTA and what has actually happened makes it even more essential that he explain to us precisely how he would address the problems that already exist, and what his vision is for the future should he be granted such sweeping authority. Because frankly, the administration has not spelled out why it needs this authority, nor what it will mean for the Nation.

Unfortunately, I can venture a fairly good guess as to what it will mean, based on history. The chart behind me represents the U.S. international merchandise trade from 1947 until last year. For 25 out of the 27 years preceding fast-track authority in 1974, the United States ran a trade surplus. Then, after 1975, the bottom started falling out.

This sea of red ink behind me not only represents millions of dollars in deficit—over \$190 billion last year (\$191.2 billion)—but lost jobs and shattered lives. For each billion dollars in trade deficit, another 20,000 people are displaced from their jobs—according to the Foreign Trade Division of the Census Bureau, that number is approaching 3.8 million. Every \$50,000 in trade deficit is one lost job.

We hear time and time again that enormous opportunities will be created for the American people through trade agreements the President can negotiate if he has fast-track authority. But if the agreements already negotiated are any indication, it's time to put the brakes on, not hit the accelerator. Because working Americans can't afford any more "opportunities" like this.

Right now, each week, the United States borrows from abroad or sells assets worth \$3 billion to pay for our trade losses. All across the country, workers are taking cuts in pay—or worse, taking home pink slips. And we are left to wonder how trade agreements that had promised so much have delivered so little. Just look at the lessons of NAFTA.

NAFTA, we were told, would improve our trade deficit with Canada and Mexico. So what's the reality? Before

NAFTA in 1993, we had a \$1.7 billion surplus with Mexico. As of last year, it's now a \$16.2 billion deficit. Before NAFTA we had a \$10 billion trade deficit with Canada. After only 3 years of NAFTA, we had a \$23 billion deficit. And during those 3 years under NAFTA, our combined merchandise trade deficits with Canada and Mexico have grown 433 percent, as indicated by this chart showing the tremendous downward turn taken after NAFTA.

We all know that, with trade agreements, there are winners and there are losers. But a quick review of the current NAFTA standings shows that, in sports terms, we are well below .500. The White House has claimed credit for 90,000 to 160,000 American jobs from NAFTA. Yet the Economic Policy Institute has issued a report that there are jobs losses in all 50 States because of NAFTA, more than 390,000 jobs eliminated since NAFTA took effect in 1994.

Considering our experience prior to 1994, we can ill afford these kind of results. An October EPI briefing paper states that in the 15 years preceding NAFTA the U.S. goods and services trade deficit eliminated a total of 2.4 million job opportunities, 2.2 million in the manufacturing sector alone. That means 83 percent of the total job decline was in the manufacturing sector.

For example, in my home State of Maine, between 1980 and the inception of NAFTA the Maine footwear industry—the largest in the Nation—lost over 9,000 jobs to countries like Mexico because our Government sat on its hands in spite of recommended action by the International Trade Commission. And in the past three years alone, there have been significant losses in the textile and shoe industries—over 8,000 people have lost their jobs. I have already witnessed too many hard-working people lose their livelihood for me to risk more American jobs.

I am unwilling to trade well-paying jobs with benefits for lower paying ones—but that's precisely what's happened under our ill-conceived trade agreements. As the trade deficit and globalization of U.S. industries have grown, more quality jobs have been lost to imports than have been gained in the lower paying sectors that are experiencing rapid export growth. Increased import shares have displaced almost twice as many high-paying, high-skill jobs than increased exports have created.

Of course, NAFTA has created some good jobs. But the fact that increased imports have caused a large trade deficit tell us that more high-paying jobs were lost than gained in the push for more trade.

Those deficits—and the path the United States is going down—are well illustrated by this chart which shows three roads that have diverged under the previous reign of fast-track authority, first instituted in 1974. Up to that point, Japanese, German, and United States merchandise trade was humming along essentially in balance.

Beginning almost at the start of 1975, however, we clearly see the United States plunging into deficit, while Germany and Japan both enjoy a trade surplus. To paraphrase Robert Frost, the road less traveled certainly has made all the difference—in this case, not for the better. In other words, under NAFTA as well as other previous trade agreements, there have been many more losers than winners.

So we must ask the President: How do you explain the job losses? How do you explain the trade deficit explosion? And what is it going to mean for the future of the country? The affect of NAFTA on these issues was seriously miscalculated—what assurances do we have that the administration's record will be better in the next 5 years, after multiple agreements?

We also need assurances that agreements negotiated will be agreements fulfilled. Unfortunately, after we have negotiated past trade agreements, I do not believe that the United States has aggressively pursued enforcement of the elimination of trade barriers with other countries, whether they are tariff or nontariff barriers. Why then would we grant this authority on a broad basis for whatever agreements may be negotiated by the administration?

The American Chamber of Commerce in Japan summed it up best in a study earlier this year concluding that "it has often been more important for the two governments to reach agreements and declare victory than to undertake the difficult task of monitoring the agreements to ensure their implementation produces results."

The bottom line is, long after the signing ceremonies and handshakes are forgotten, these trade agreements continue to affect lives on a daily basis. We must remember that our responsibilities don't end with the ratification of our trade agreements—they are just beginning.

Unfortunately, I can only assume from my personal experience that this is a lesson not yet learned by the administration. What other conclusion is there when the NAFTA clean-up plan for the United States-Mexico border has generated only 1 percent of the promised funding? What other conclusion is there when other countries continue to violate our laws by dumping goods in the United States below cost and because of extensive subsidies?

The Atlantic salmon farmers of Maine are a case in point. While we debate giving the President greater authority to close more trade deals, they have a case pending with the Department of Commerce because subsidized, low-priced Atlantic salmon from Chile—which provides at least 25 different subsidies to its producers, I might add—are being dumped in the United States. And while this situation remains unresolved, we have lost more than 50 percent of our salmon aquaculture industry in Maine, while Chile's imports into the United States have risen 75 percent and United States

salmon prices have dropped by 30 percent.

So forgive me if I am at a complete loss as to how bringing Chile into NAFTA will create more and better jobs, and a higher standard of living for the hard working people of Maine.

And I could not talk about empty trade promises without mentioning Maine's potato industry. For years I have been raising the issue of an unfair trade barrier with Canada on bulk shipments of potatoes exported to Canada, a trade barrier that is in violation of the National Treatment Principle of article III, paragraph 4 of the GATT, to be specific. This provision requires that GATT/WTO member countries treat imported products the same as goods of local origin with respect to all laws, regulations, and requirements that affect the sale, purchase, transportation, distribution, and use of the goods.

In December of 1994, USTR's then Trade Representative Micky Kantor said he would be filing a trade case with the GATT-WTO to overturn Canada's policy of bulk easements. So what has happened so far? Nothing.

Almost 2 years later, in September of 1996, I wrote to President Clinton to express my belief that we had waited long enough, to urge him to live up to the USTR commitment, and to proceed with a trade case on bulk easements. One week later, USTR's Charlene Barshefsky called me to let me know that serious bilateral consultations on Canadian trade practices would begin.

These talks lead nowhere—in fact, the USTR then actually backtracked on filing a trade case. Two months later, the ITC was asked to investigate. They did, and in July of this year, issued a report, which stated, and I quote: "Canadian regulations restrict imports of bulk shipments of fresh potatoes for processing or repacking." The report also stated, "the United States maintains no such restrictions."

So where are we today? Well, this past week, the U.S. Trade Representative once again promised that bilateral talks on bulk easements will begin no later than March 1998. It looks to me, as Yogi Berra once said, like *deja vu* all over again. Is this how the administration plans to handle enforcement for future trade agreements? Last week, the President asked the American people to give him the benefit of the doubt on fast track. I believe we need the benefit of enforcement of existing agreements first.

Where are our strict and mandatory enforcement provisions when our trading partners bring injury to our domestic workers? We need to provide the enforcement to ensure full reciprocity in market access and reduction of export subsidies—enforcement and oversight which, up until now, has been lacking.

Yet, we are told that specific concerns should be weighed against the broader economic, political and social aspects of NAFTA expansion. We are told that, overall, no major negative impact is expected if we expand the

trade agreement with Chile—except of course for industries like fish, forestry, and fruit, all of which are important to the economic stability of my home State of Maine.

That is why I am not prepared to give up the right to seek assurances that these industries won't be decimated by a flawed trade agreement. The stakes are far too high for Congress to abrogate its responsibilities to the bureaucrats and special interests.

Free trade, as we have seen, doesn't work unless we have agreements that also provide for fair trade, and Congress must have the right to exercise its responsibility to ensure fair trade in each and every agreement that comes down the road. The Senate must be more than just a debating society for global trade issues that affect each and every one of us.

Our country negotiated trade agreements for nearly 200 years before fast-track authority was first granted in 1974, when trade was carved out for an exception unlike any other kind of treaty. We continue to negotiate treaties and agreements on everything from chemical weapons to extradition to tuna-dolphin without fast-track authority. And I have heard no rational explanation of why trade should be treated differently.

I certainly do not believe Congress should approve fast-track authority on the basis of fear that the United States will not have a seat at the trade bargaining table. There is no question we are living in an era dominated by global economics and trade, but at the same time we are an economic super power with an 8.3 trillion dollar economy and 203 million willing buyers—an attractive market to say the least.

I believe it would continue to be in the best interests of nations across the globe to negotiate with the United States—and those of us in Congress are committed to crafting mutually beneficial trade agreements. I think all of us in Congress understand full well the realities of trade as we approach the new millennium. We must also understand, however, that our trade record under fast track mandates that Congress have a strong voice in the process.

Mr. President, we are elected to deliberate and vote on the major issues of our day. Well, what could be more important than trade agreements that will directly affect hard working Americans and their families?

It is imperative that we not relinquish our right to have a voice in these agreements. I don't want to see a repeat of what happened during the summer of 1993 during negotiations on NAFTA side agreements, when United States negotiators, clearly under tremendous pressure to reach agreement on the outstanding issues and conclude the pact in time for a January vote, let Canada and Mexico off the hook on a number of different issues. We need better oversight, more discussion and debate, not less, because we stand at a very important juncture.

A poignant story out of New England illustrates where we are at the end of the 20th century, and points up the failures of past agreements.

Two years ago, Malden Mills, a textile mill in Massachusetts, burned to the ground, leaving thousands unemployed and putting 300 more jobs in jeopardy at the Bridgton Knitting Mills in Maine. In the wake of the fire, the mill's owner, Aaron Feuerstein, had several attractive choices, including rebuilding in another state or country with lower wages, anywhere from Texas to Thailand. Or he simply could have retired after four decades of running Malden Mills, founded by his grandfather more than 90 years ago.

Instead, last month, Mr. Feuerstein opened a new, state-of-the-art textile mill, and brought 2,630 very grateful Americans back to work. And the rebuilding of the plant has become a symbol of loyalty to employees and to an entire community. Mr. Feuerstein's actions are admirable and all of America rightfully extended their appreciation to a man who chose the difficult path over the easy, and perhaps more profitable.

But let's step back for a moment and ask ourselves why this story became a national sensation. The sad fact is, it stood out so glaringly because it is the exception to the rule. The idea that American textile jobs would be kept in the United States when they could easily be shipped overseas is news because it hardly ever happens that way anymore.

Mr. President, I don't want to continue down this path, but I fear we will if we don't retain our congressional right to speak out against trade agreements that aren't in our best interest.

We have an obligation to all those who have already lost good jobs to bad trade agreements, and to all those who are in danger of becoming displaced in the future, to take the time to do it right. And the President has an obligation to fully explain how the wrongs of the past will be fixed, and why the future will be different. This he simply has not done.

We stand poised to begin a new era of prosperity in the global marketplace, but I do not believe that fast track is the way to get us there, I do not believe the President has made his case for this broad authority, and I urge my colleagues to defeat this fast-track legislation. ●

#### ITALIAN HOSPITAL SOCIETY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I note that the Italian Hospital Society is celebrating its 60th anniversary with a dinner and awards presentation on Sunday, November 16th. It is a most notable organization guided by compassion and philanthropy to assist the hospital and health services of Italian communities in New York.

This year's ceremonies will salute four eminent Italian-Americans who

have brought the hopes of the Italian Hospital Society closer to reality. I am especially gratified that the committee honors a doctor, a businessman, a union leader, and the principle inspiration of my life, my mamma.

I can speak with particular knowledge and delight about Mamma, known to the public as Antoinette Cioffari D'Amato. She was born and grew up in Brooklyn, the daughter of Italian-American parents. In growing up as her child, I was able to see the qualities, character and enthusiasm for life and for family which the society salutes in her public life. It was she who inspired confidence, exercised discipline and demanded the pursuit of education. It was she who was the foundation for responsibility to the community and for civic involvement.

In her marriage of 61 years to my father, Armand, a teacher and son of Italian-American parents, she was a prototypical "mamma"—cooking, cleaning, exhorting, reprimanding and loving her three children, Alfonse, Armand, and Joanne. During World War II, while my father was in the Army, she worked in a defense plant. As part of the emigration from Brooklyn to Long Island, the D'Amato family moved to Island Park where she and Dad continue to reside. Both still work in the insurance brokerage which has been the family business for over 60 years.

It was my political campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1980 that brought Mamma and her many talents to a wider audience. The advertisements she made for my campaign made me a winner. Ever since she has been unstinting as an active and enthusiastic citizen of New York. She has had a special interest in affordable housing services for older citizens through her membership on the board of the New York Foundation for Senior Citizens Inc. She is a television celebrity and the author of her own cookbook—"Cooking and Canning with Mamma D'Amato."

I commend the Italian Hospital Society for the honor they give my mother for her public participation; but, for all the lessons and love of the private Antoinette Cioffari D'AMATO, only a hug and a kiss are the proper awards.

ERNESTO JOFRE

Ernesto Jofre, a native of Chile, came to the United States as a political refugee in 1976. He had spent the 3 previous years as a political prisoner of the Pinochet dictatorship. He joined Local 169 of the Amalgamated Clothing & Textile Workers' Union [ACTWU] as an auditor. Subsequently, he served Local 169 as an organizer, business agent, assistant manager, and then became manager and secretary-treasurer in 1993. He then became manager and secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Northeast Regional Joint Board of the Union of Needletrades, Industrial & Textile Employees [UNITE!] in 1994.

He is a vice president of the New Jersey Industrial Union Council, Member

of the boards of directors of the Amalgamated Bank, the Jewish Labor Committee, and Americans for Democratic Action. He is plan administrator of the health and welfare funds and pension funds of Local 169, UNITE.

MARIO SPAGNUOLO, M.D.

Dr. Mario Spagnuolo was born in Naples in 1930; he graduated cum laude from the School of Medicine of the University of Naples. He trained in New York City at St. Claire's Hospital, the Irvington House Institute for Rheumatic Diseases and Bellevue Hospital. He was the director of the Irvington House Institute and associate professor of medicine at New York University Medical School.

He has written about 60 research papers in rheumatic diseases and several articles for textbooks. An editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine accompanying one of his papers, in January 1968, defined the paper as an extraordinary clinical investigation. The Journal reprinted one of his articles in 1996, 25 years after its publication in 1966, as a "Classic in Medicine."

He has practiced internal medicine in Yonkers for the last 25 years. He has been president of the Westchester Health Services Network. He practices at St. John's Riverside Hospital in Yonkers, where he was director of medicine and is now chief of the medical staff and a member of the board of trustees.

He is married to Kathryn Birchall Spagnuolo. They have four children—Mario, Sandra, Peter, and Eugene, a daughter-in-law—Linda, and three grandchildren—JoAnne, Matthew, and Stephanie.

VINCENT ZUCCARELLI

Vincent Zuccarelli was born in Mongrassano, a small town in Calabria, Italy. He started his education in the seminary and continued through the "Liceo Classico." He was a private tutor of classical languages, Latin and Greek, for the students of the Middle and High Gymnasium School and was head of electoral office in his jurisdiction for 5 years.

Vincent came to the United States in 1958. In 1959, with his brothers, he engaged in and formed the food business in Mount Vernon, NY and Florida known as the Zuccarelli Brothers.

He has been married for 43 years to his wife Nella and has three sons: Mario, Fiore, and Joseph. Vincent and Nella also have six grandchildren: Vincent, Nelli, Marie, Juliana, Joey, and Danielle. He and his wife reside in Bronxville, NY.

He joined the Calabria Society in 1985, and has become an active and proud member. He is the first dinner-dance chairman of the Casa Dei Bambini Italiani Di New York. Mr. Zuccarelli is a member of the Council of the National Italian-American Foundation of Washington, DC, promoting education for the Italian-American values and traditions, and presently he is the NIAF Westchester County Coordinator.