

foreign signatories, the changing market conditions with the growing prominence of China, and the ineffective "injurious pricing" or anti-dumping provision—especially in light of South Korea's massive expansion of its shipbuilding capacity throughout the negotiations.

Ms. SNOWE. These concerns and the agreement's negative implications for the U.S. Navy shipbuilding industrial base were ignored by the negotiators of this agreement. U.S. shipbuilders were also dismayed that they were granted no transition period in contrast to what was granted to the foreign governments. The successful, but modest, Title XI loan guarantee program would be rendered ineffective immediately upon the agreement's entry into force and the domestic trade of the United States, as governed by the Jones Act, was placed in severe jeopardy by our negotiators. In an effort to correct these weaknesses and flaws, the House of Representatives amended the implementing legislation (H.R. 2754) to address the major national security concerns of the agreement.

Mr. LOTT. The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative has maintained throughout the debate on this agreement that the Jones Act, which requires ships transporting cargo between two U.S. ports to be U.S.-built, -owned, and -operated, is exempt from the agreement. This is only partially true. Although the agreement does not repeal the law, it establishes a framework and procedure for foreign governments to take retaliatory actions against U.S. shipbuilders and U.S. exporters for ships constructed for the domestic trades of the United States. These countermeasures include bid restrictions and bid tariffs against U.S. builders seeking international orders if they also benefit from Jones Act orders. The agreement also provides that GATT-related tariff concessions may be withdrawn against other U.S. products to offset the benefit of Jones Act ship construction contracts to U.S. builders. Moreover, the agreement states that the Jones Act is a derogation of the agreement—and I quote—"could undermine the balance of rights and obligations of the Parties under the Agreement and is unacceptable to the other Parties."

Ms. SNOWE. U.S. ownership, manning, and construction of vessels serving the Jones Act trade has provided the Department of Defense with a pool of trained mariners, vessels, and the industrial capability to respond in time to national defense emergencies. For example, the very shipyards that build and repair Jones Act vessels were called upon to activate military reserve ships during Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield, and it was the trained mariners who operate Jones Act vessels in peacetime who were called upon to crew these military ships once activated. The Jones Act contributes to the maintenance of this skilled work force and defense industrial capability.

Because of the importance of the Jones Act to our national security, the House adopted an amendment specifically prohibiting the imposition of trade countermeasures against U.S. shipbuilders and other exporters for Jones Act ship construction. This amendment is essential to our Nation's defense readiness.

Mr. LOTT. The House also adopted an amendment defining and exempting "military reserve vessels" from coverage under the agreement. This provision is essential to ensure that military ships—such as Army, Navy, and Marine Corps surge and prepositioned sealift ships—cannot be deemed commercial ships under the agreement because of their dual-use characteristics and capability. Without this exemption, DOD may be precluded from procuring military reserve and auxiliary ships with defense features from U.S. shipbuilders without the threat of retaliatory trade countermeasures.

Ms. SNOWE. Many of DOD's reserve and auxiliary ships are commercially built, owned, and operated, and they are chartered to DOD under long-term lease agreements. The U.S. Navy intends to continue this approach to acquiring these needed assets in the future. Furthermore, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to completely separate a ship's defense features from its commercial features. Therefore, the implementing legislation needs to contain the definition and exemption for these types of ships or the United States will be subjected to an international trade panel's interpretation of what is, or is not, a military vessel or a defense feature.

Mr. LOTT. As I mentioned earlier, the only government support program for U.S. shipbuilders is the Title XI Ship Loan Guarantee Program. The program was revived and amended in FY 1994 as part of the National Shipbuilding Initiative contained in the National Defense Authorization Act. The purpose of the program was to help U.S. shipbuilders attract commercial shipbuilding orders in the face of a dramatic turndown in Navy orders and foreign government commercial shipbuilding subsidies.

Ms. SNOWE. Title XI provides for a government guarantee of commercial loans for the construction of ships in the United States for U.S. and export customers. Up to 87.5 percent of the 25-year loan is guaranteed under the program. Upon entry into force of the OECD Shipbuilding Agreement, however, the terms of title XI would be immediately changed to guarantee only up to 80 percent of a commercial loan over a 12-year period. According to U.S. shipbuilders, the current orders for construction of large oceangoing commercial ships would not have been consummated under these terms and conditions.

Mr. LOTT. Almost every signatory to this agreement—except the United States—was granted special transition subsidy authority for a period of 3

years. Many members of the House of Representatives and Senate do not understand why the title XI program should not continue under its current terms and conditions for a 3-year period given the agreements's special deals, exemptions, and transition programs in the billions of dollars for Belgium, Portugal, Spain, Germany, France and South Korea. This inequity in the transition rules is extremely detrimental to U.S. builders were disadvantaged for 15 years while they received no government subsidies in the face of billions by foreign governments. Moreover, without a 3-year continuance of title XI, U.S. shipbuilders would be three years further behind their foreign competition. This is unacceptable to the majority in Congress.

Ms. SNOWE. The House bill would place the U.S. on an equal par with foreign signatories time-wise. It would allow title XI to continue at its present terms and conditions during the 3-year transition period in which foreign signatories were granted very generous subsidy concessions. Furthermore, major U.S. shipbuilders desperately need this extension to the program if they are to complete their transition back to building commercial ships. If this transition is unsuccessful, the Navy's core shipbuilding base will not be sustained to meet its future requirements.

Mr. LOTT. In closing, it is incumbent upon each Congress to ensure that our international trade agreements are in our best national interest. Rubber stamping every international agreement, regardless of its content or impact, is not in anyone's best interest. I understand that the office of the U.S. Trade Representative has invested years of hard work in reaching the OECD Agreement. Unfortunately, it falls abysmally short of the objectives established by the very industry which sought an international agreement. After all, who better understands the shipbuilding industry than the shipbuilding industry itself? And for that matter, who in Congress better understand our national security interests than the committees with jurisdiction over national security policy?

There are major disagreements in Congress on whether this agreement is good or bad for this country. Indications from the Office of the USTR are that it is unwilling to reopen the negotiations to achieve an agreement that addresses the concerns of the majority in Congress of both political parties. If this is the position of the U.S. Trade Representative, then I can only say that pursuing implementing legislation in the 105th Congress will result in the same outcome as that of the 104th Congress. I would hope that the USTR would have learned something from last year's experience and not waste its time or our with a repeat performance.

IN MEMORY OF PAUL E. TSONGAS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I was saddened Saturday to learn of the loss of

one of the great men that I have had the honor of serving with in the U.S. Senate, Paul E. Tsongas of Massachusetts.

Paul Tsongas and I arrived in this body at the same time almost exactly 18 years ago in 1979. By that time Paul had already distinguished himself in 4 years of service in the House of Representatives, including legislation creating the first urban national historical park in his beloved hometown of Lowell. This became the catalyst for a remarkable renaissance in that historical New England mill town.

He arrived as the first Peace Corps veteran ever elected to the Senate. He valued highly his opportunity to serve in Ethiopia and spoke frequently of those 2 years as the formative years of his desire for public service. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he was a voice for human rights around the world, but particularly on the African continent. In his 1981 book, "The Road From Here," Paul wrote, "[Human rights] are rooted in our culture and history, and we should champion them. Third World people need to have us honor this principle because if we don't, no one effectively will. And ultimately it is the moral and economic strength of America that will count, not just our military might."

Paul accomplished a great deal in a short time in the Senate, including the passage of the Alaska Lands Act of 1980 which more than doubled the size of the national park system and which President Carter called the most important conservation legislation of the century.

However, he will be remembered best for his years after the Senate. He retired from the Senate in 1984 after learning that he had cancer, pledging to devote more time to his family. In the book, "Heading Home", about his decision to leave the Senate, he wrote: "On their deathbed, no one ever said, 'I wish I had spent more time with my business.'"

He overcame cancer undergoing a then-experimental medical procedure, and went on to become a Presidential candidate in 1992, and a founder of the Concord Coalition, a bipartisan organization which has become a credible and widely-respected grassroots voice for fiscal responsibility in government.

As the family and friends of Paul Tsongas mourn his death and celebrate his life, Barbara and I will have Niki and Paul's three daughters Ashley, Katina, and Molly in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. President, a member of my staff, Rich Arenberg, who served Paul Tsongas for more than 10 years as a staff member and friend wrote a few personal words which are most apt:

Paul Tsongas was an uncommon man. He honored America with the purity of his honesty and candor. There was no private Paul Tsongas, no public Paul Tsongas. He gave totally and completely of himself. He said exactly what he believed. In an age of partisan

vitriol, he spoke softly and without animus. Although his voice was cool, his beliefs were passionately and tenaciously held. He believed that rational people of good will could solve any problem, bridge any difference, and lead by the force of reason. Paul Tsongas loved his family more than anything on earth and he loved his country deeply. He saw little distinction between the two because he believed the greatest gift we can give to our children is a strong future for America.

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT CLINTON

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, yesterday, in a moving ceremony, we witnessed the swearing in of President Bill Clinton and Vice President AL GORE for their second term. The inaugural ceremony is significant not only to the history of our Nation, but for the message it sends to the rest of the world about our democracy.

The ceremony required a tremendous amount of planning by many, many people. The extensive preparations included construction of the platform, ticket distribution, coordination of security measures, organization of the ceremony, planning the luncheon in Statuary Hall and countless other tasks.

Leading this team of dedicated people was the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator JOHN WARNER. As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, he had the monumental task of making the arrangements for this historic occasion. He performed his responsibilities with great efficiency and with outstanding attention to every detail. As master of ceremonies, he skillfully orchestrated the entire program. I, along with my colleagues, would like to thank Senator WARNER and congratulate him on a job well done.

In addition, I would like to applaud the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Senator WENDELL FORD. His contribution of hard work and past experience as Chairman of the committee was evident in the success of this endeavor. I wish to express my gratitude to Senator FORD for his hard work.

I would also like to thank and congratulate the other members of the Joint Inaugural Committee for such a successful ceremony. Those members were Majority Leader LOTT, Speaker GINGRICH, Representative ARMEY, and Minority Leader GEPHARDT. In addition, the members of the committee were ably assisted by the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as by personnel from the executive branch. The success of the ceremony demonstrated tremendous cooperation between both parties, as well as both Houses of Congress and the executive branch.

I offer my appreciation to everyone who contributed countless hours to the 1997 inauguration ceremony, particularly to the chairman, Senator WARNER, and the ranking member, Senator FORD. Thanks to the efforts of all in-

volved, the ceremony will be a memorable event for our Nation.

KENTUCKY DOMINICAN SISTERS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am proud to stand before you and my colleagues today to recognize the 175th anniversary of the founding of the Kentucky Dominican Sisters. They are the oldest group of Dominican Sisters in the United States and I am pleased they chose to put down roots in Kentucky.

It was a time in our Commonwealth's history when the rural communities were sometimes forgotten. But nine pioneers took it upon themselves to help meet the needs of those in rural Kentucky. They made a commitment to the community to serve through service, prayers, and study—a commitment which has lasted 175 years. It was this group of women who laid the foundation for the Kentucky Dominican Sisters of today.

The Sisters responded to the needs of their time. They nursed soldiers in Kentucky during the Civil War and established hospitals for residents who previously traveled miles for emergency care. As the times have changed so have the needs of citizens of Kentucky. But the Sisters are still answering those in distress. My regret today is that I can only highlight some of their recent work including working with persons living with AIDS, assisting refugees to resettle and advocating for food, shelters and health care for not only the people of Kentucky, but for those throughout our great United States.

On April 4, 1997, Sisters from around the United States will gather at their Motherhouse in Springfield, KY, for a weekend of celebration. Mr. President, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in honoring the Kentucky Dominican Sisters for 175 years of service.

HONORING BILL WEBER, ST. CHARLES CHAMBER OF COM- MERCE 1996 CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the St. Charles Chamber of Commerce 1996 Citizen of the Year, William H. Weber. On January 24, 1996, Bill Weber will gather with friends, family, and colleagues to celebrate his distinguished contributions to his community.

Bill is a lifelong resident of Missouri and St. Charles. His volunteer career has touched innumerable organizations with his leadership, commitment, and unselfish hard work. Bill has been the driving force behind such significant projects as fund raising to build both the St. Peters Rec-Plex and the YMCA of St. Charles County. After a volcano destroyed the city of Armero, Colombia, South America, he worked tirelessly to build a YMCA facility to provide basic needs and housing for the children of that disaster.