

None of it has to be built—it is already in place because of the past exodus of residents. Washington, DC is typical of our older cities where the population has gone from 800,000 in 1950 to 540,000 today—a 32 percent drop.

And, there are tremendous economic benefits to what you are doing. Studies have shown that dollar for dollar, historic preservation is one of the highest job-generating economic development options available. In other words, one million dollars spent on rehabilitation creates more permanent jobs, does more for retail sales, and does more for family incomes in a community than a like amount spent on new construction.

Because of efforts of the members of the National Trust over the years, and the leadership it has given, my state is a microcosm of what is taking place across our nation. Many of our magnificent marble palaces in Newport were saved from being subdivided into a series of apartments and instead were preserved as originally built. Now, they are by far the largest tourist attractions in our state, and extremely important to the economy of Newport.

Likewise, historic districts are flourishing and home owners are eager to buy turn of the century homes that were so soundly built.

This didn't just happen. It came about with the consent inspiration and guidance from the National Trust.

Let me move to point two. You are on the cutting edge of the environmental movement.

Why do I say that? If we can be successful in enticing a goodly portion of our citizens to live within our cities, we have helped stanch the flow of what we've come to know as urban sprawl. We are losing our farmland at a frightening rate—two acres every minute of every day, according to estimates of the American Farmland Trust.

There is no question that every new home that is built in our suburbs or every new housing development that is created, affects some creature's habitat. I have long held that if we give nature half a chance, it will rebound. But we must give it that half a chance. Regrettably, in too few areas are we doing that. The National Trust is at the forefront of environmental action by making our cities more attractive, thus reducing the paving and development of our countryside.

Few environmental challenges equal that of global warming, and the principal culprit in that area is the automobile. If people remain within cities, there are indeed fewer autos on the road, which means less pollution, less global warming.

Now for point three: some suggestions to make your efforts even more effective.

Do all you can to make the federal government a leader in historic preservation. When we do something really good, cheer us on. For example, we can all be delighted and encouraged by the inclusion of large sums of money in transportation legislation for so-called enhancements. These substantial moneys can be used, among other things, to restore historic buildings. Senator Pat Moynihan deserves the principal credit for the Enhancement Program, which we first did in the 1991 Highway Bill and continued in the 1998 Transportation Bill known as TEA-21. This was a radical departure from previous highway bills and Senator Moynihan deserves tremendous credit.

We in the federal government can also lead by example by restoring post offices and courthouses rather than abandoning them and moving their activities to the suburbs.

Let me give you an example of a courthouse we managed to save that was historically and architecturally important. Almost a decade ago, I visited the traditional home of the federal judiciary in Old San Juan,

Puerto Rico—a court house that had fallen into disrepair. It was a shambles, and there was a movement underway to abandon the structure in favor of constructing a new one in the suburbs. But the building's historic significance coupled with such architectural flourishes as a beautiful two-story loggia overlooking the harbor, warranted its preservation.

Thanks to the General Services Administration's preservation efforts, and a \$35 million restoration, this beautiful courthouse has been saved and will be dedicated next spring.

The restoration of the Courthouse should spur a renaissance in San Juan's historic quarter. Lawyers doing business at court will frequent nearby restaurants and shops. Hotels and other businesses may spring up as more people visit the area.

We can create incentives in the tax code to promote restoration. As many of you know, those who restore historic buildings for commercial purposes are already eligible for tax credits. Since these provisions have been in place, \$18 billion dollars have been generated in private investment. You should be proud of these numbers, for they didn't happen of their own accord. They came about with the constant inspiration and guidance from the National Trust.

I have long hoped to extend these credits to homeowners through legislation called the Historic Homeownership Act. It would allow homeowners who rehabilitate homes in historic areas to take a tax credit equal to 20 percent of the project's cost. This credit could be used toward one's tax liability or in the form of a mortgage credit certificate. Because of this flexibility, these provisions would be attractive to low and middle income homeowners, not just those in the top tax brackets.

There has been overwhelming support for this legislation across the political spectrum. Earlier this year, we enacted a version of it as part of the tax bill approved by Congress. That was the bill the President subsequently vetoed. The prospects for enacting that homeownership tax credit bill this year are dim. Hopefully, next year we can do it. Before I go, I want to get this done! You can help by pestering your Senators and Representatives to support the Historic Homeownership Act.

Another major way you can lend a hand is by giving vocal support to efforts states, counties, and towns are making to preserve open spaces. If the land is going to be saved, then homes are not going to be built there.

Clearly, open space conservation and historic preservation go hand in hand. In fact, Senator Joe Lieberman and I are pressing for legislation that would accomplish both goals. It is called the Natural Resources Reinvestment Act. It would fully fund the Historic Preservation Fund at 150 million dollars per year and encourage states to set aside open space. While we may be addressing these concerns at the federal level, the time is ripe to promote ballot initiatives in your own towns and counties.

Last year, voters approved the vast majority of the 200 ballot initiatives for open space purchases to curb urban sprawl at state and local levels.

With such wide-ranging support, evidently these measures are not just the province of the elite. No, the rich and poor alike support them, because they benefit everyone.

One of the biggest successes occurred in New Jersey where voters, in 1998, set aside \$98 million to buy open space.

And, just last week, two local anti-sprawl initiatives made news in the Washington area. In Montgomery County, planners proposed to spend \$100 million over the next decade to preserve historic properties and unde-

veloped land. In addition, the city council in Rockville, Maryland approved a six-month development moratorium on single-use retail stores of 60,000 square feet or more.

There are many ways that we can encourage historic preservation at the federal level. But absent your cooperation, none of the preservation work would get done. So the rest is up to all of you. And I trust that you will carry out these initiatives with purpose and enthusiasm. Do what you can to recruit others to join your ranks.

Naysayers may ask: What difference does saving one train station or post office truly make in the future of America? My response is this: preservation is not just about conserving brick and mortar, lintel and beam. It is about the quality of life, and the possibility of a bright future. Carl Sandburg expressed the danger of losing touch with our past when he said:

"If America forgets where she came from, if people lose sight of what brought them along . . . then will begin the rot and dissolution."

Who could say it better!

On behalf of the city of Providence and Rhode Island, we look forward to sharing our historic treasures with you during your 2001 conference. Keep up the good work. Thank you.

#### THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate voted on a modest package of trade bills which included the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act. As a long time supporter of expanding trade opportunities for Vermonters and all Americans, as well as people in developing countries, I reluctantly cast my vote against this bill.

Exports are a key component of Vermont's economy. As a small state, we must promote our products beyond the Green Mountains. Vermonters are reaping the benefits of more open markets around the world and these markets are creating new jobs here at home. Not long ago, I led a Vermont trade delegation to Ireland which has one of the fastest growing economies in Europe.

Having said that, trade is about more than financial statistics. It is about more than increasing market opportunities for American products, as important and laudable a goal as that is. In our increasingly inter-connected world, trade involves a broad range of issues and concerns. As the wealthiest nation, we also have a responsibility to do what we can to ensure that the benefits of the global economy are enjoyed by people from every walk of life, here and abroad. And when we vote, we have a responsibility to ensure that legislation entitled the "African Growth and Opportunity Act", actually benefits African workers and protects their families' health and welfare, and the natural environment. The bill that was passed yesterday will not do that.

I have felt for some time that our relationship with Africa needs to change. It cannot continue to be based almost exclusively on aid, when the real engine of development, as we have seen

elsewhere in the world, is investment and trade. However, in developing a trade policy toward Africa—where poverty is deeply rooted and protections for the environment and the rights of workers are virtually non-existent—precautions must be taken to ensure that it is a sound policy that responds to Africa's unique and urgent needs.

It used to be that workers' rights and environmental concerns were treated separately from trade considerations, or not at all. Fortunately, that has begun to change. One of the reasons I voted for NAFTA was because it contained side agreements on labor and environmental issues.

However, while those agreements were a step forward, time has shown that they did not go far enough. Unfortunately, even the modest labor and environmental agreements that we fought hard to include in NAFTA were not included in the African Growth and Opportunity Act and virtually every amendment to add similar provisions was defeated. Such a step backward makes absolutely no sense.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act's provision on workers' rights, which has been included in other trade legislation, has routinely allowed countries notorious for abuses to escape without penalty. Unions have rightly criticized this provision for being vague and unenforceable. It is an invitation for exploitation of cheap African labor.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act does not include a single provision related to environmental concerns. Multinational corporations, especially mining and timber companies, have a long history of taking advantage of Africa's weak environmental laws and contributing to pollution, deforestation and the uprooting of people. If barriers to foreign investment are lowered or eliminated—as the Act calls for—and meaningful, enforceable environmental protections are not put in place, these problems will only get worse.

Like the NAFTA debate, however, the rhetoric on both sides of this issue was overblown. The African Growth and Opportunity Act is not, as some of its supporters claimed, an historic step toward integrating Africa into the global economy. At best, this Act will have a modest impact. It simply offers limited market access to African countries under the Generalized System of Preferences and establishes a U.S.-African trade and economic forum.

On the other hand, the African Growth and Opportunity Act will not, as some of its opponents claimed, force African countries to cut spending on education and health care, and to adhere to stringent International Monetary Fund conditions. It rewards African countries that are taking steps toward economic and political reforms, as most African countries are already doing, but it does not force them to do anything.

In all my time in the Senate, this is the first attempt that has been made

to redefine our relationship with Africa from one of dependency to one which begins to promotes economic growth and self-reliance. This is long overdue, and the opportunity to address these issues is not likely to come again soon. I had hoped that when the African Growth and Opportunity Act reached the floor it would have provided for expanded export opportunities for both Africans and Americans while protecting African workers and the environment.

Many of my concerns about the African Growth and Opportunity Act, also hold true for the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act. I fully support efforts to expand U.S. trade with Caribbean Basin countries and to provide these countries with trade benefits that will help them compete in the global economy. However, again, it is vitally important that the trade benefits included in this Act actually benefit those who often need them the most—workers and their families. Virtually every amendment that would have required Caribbean companies to institute fair and enforceable labor standards before they could be eligible for trade benefits under the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act was defeated, and crucial protections were therefore not included.

Mr. President, it is disappointing that given the opportunity to simultaneously redefine our relationship with Africa, re-examine our trade policy toward the Caribbean Basin and expand international economic opportunities for Americans, that the approach and the outcome was so flawed.

#### FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER YITZHAK RABIN'S ASSASSINATION

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Today is the fourth anniversary of the assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. On October 25, 1995, ten days before his assassination, Prime Minister Rabin spoke in the Rotunda of the capitol at a ceremony celebrating the passage of the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995. The honor of introducing him fell to me. I said, "History will honor him as the magnanimous leader of a brave people—brave enough to fight daunting odds—perhaps even braver still to make peace." Four years later as Israel and the Palestinians prepare to begin final status negotiations, I think it appropriate to remember the man who helped lead his people down this road to peace. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my remarks on that occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN ON THE PASSAGE OF THE JERUSALEM EMBASSY ACT OF 1995, UNITED STATES CAPITOL ROTUNDA, OCTOBER 25, 1995

My pleasant and most appropriate task this afternoon is to introduce one of Jerusalem's most illustrious sons.

History will acknowledge him as the unifier of the City of David—the Chief of Staff whose armies breached the barbed wire and removed the cinder blocks that has sundered the city of peace.

History will honor him as the magnanimous leader of a brave people—brave enough to fight against daunting odds—perhaps even braver still to make peace.

History will remember him as the last of the generation of founders—the intrepid children of a two thousand year dream. Almost certainly, the last Israeli Prime Minister to play a leading role in the War for Independence, he was also the first—and to this day the only—Prime Minister to be born in the Holy Land.

He is a proud son of Jerusalem. As a young man he dreamed of a career as an engineer. But destiny had other plans and he fought and led for almost half a century so that his people could live in peace and security.

Nobel Laureate, statesman, military hero, friend of our nation where he served with distinction as an ambassador in this very city, he honors us today by joining us in our festivities—the Prime Minister of Israel, the Honorable Yitzhak Rabin.

#### AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE A WTO MINISTERIAL REPORT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased that yesterday the Senate adopted my amendment to H.R. 434, the African and Caribbean trade legislation, regarding the upcoming World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Seattle, Washington, from November 30 to December 3, 1999.

My amendment is straightforward. It expresses the sense of the Congress on the importance of the new round of international trade negotiations that will be launched at the WTO Ministerial Conference, and would require the United States Trade Representative (USTR) to submit a report to Congress regarding discussions at the Ministerial on antidumping and countervailing duty agreements. My amendment sends a message from the Congress that these talks are significant and that we will be examining these discussions closely. Specifically, it sends a message to our trading partners that we have no intention of allowing the antidumping and countervailing duty agreements to be nonchalantly relinquished, and that we will be keeping an official record of any discussions on these topics.

I am strongly opposed to opening the antidumping and countervailing duty agreements to negotiation, and, therefore, I am very pleased that the Administration reports that it will put forth a U.S. trade agenda that reaffirms trade remedy laws, and, specifically, U.S. rights to enforce antidumping and countervailing duty measures. Nevertheless, we should expect that certain WTO member governments will attempt to weaken the current antidumping and countervailing rules during the next round of talks. Certain WTO member governments will likely attempt to use the antidumping and countervailing rules as leverage against other U.S. priority issues, thus, pitting U.S. industries against one another.