

peace and have fully cooperated at every turn with OSCE representatives. They have taken risks for peace despite a decade-long blockade of their countries and frequent acts of Azerbaijani aggression.

I strongly urge President Ailyev, if he is serious about peace, to come back to the negotiating table, cease all calls for military action, and end the oppressive blockade against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

---

#### PRE-AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE STANDARD TRADE NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, as the United States grapples with an historically large trade deficit, and many of our farmers and manufacturers face growing and cumulative competitive disadvantages in the international marketplace, the time has come for Congress to work with the administration on behalf of a stronger trade policy.

Clearly, the centerpiece of a new and more aggressive trade policy has to be new authority which allows our government to pursue trade agreements that level the international playing field for American workers and American products. Congress must act quickly and firmly to give our trade negotiators the authority they need to defend our interest and open distant markets to the creation of our sweat, ingenuity and freedom.

Last week, I outlined to the House the major provisions of my bill, H.R. 1446, the Standard Trade Negotiating Authority Act. At that time, I promised this House I would return and discuss at greater detail the major components of this bill.

Today, I would like to focus on the pre-authorization requirements. This section requires the President to consult with Congress and receive an affirmative vote to authorize the initiation of trade negotiations with any country or countries before proceeding with them. WTO negotiations, which are already authorized by existing agreements, would be exempt from this pre-authorization requirement.

Mr. Speaker, Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution specifically grants to Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Unfortunately, over the last several decades, Congress has almost entirely ceded the policy making initiative over this increasingly vital part of our national economy. Under Fast Track, we eliminated our oversight and opportunity to influence the outcome of potentially far-reaching agreements to one single up-or-down vote.

I believe this lack of input and transparency has led directly to the increasing controversy surrounding trade

agreements and the inability of the Nation to have an intelligent and conclusive discussion about trade policy.

For example, NAFTA was never contemplated during the Fast Track authorization then in existence. In 1988, when we last authorized Fast Track authority, NAFTA was not even discussed. But within a couple of years, NAFTA was brought back in toto for an up-or-down vote.

Likewise, the 1994 GATT agreement included changes to section 201 and 301 of our trade laws, the antisurge and antidumping provisions, without any prior discussion in Congress.

How then would the pre-authorization requirements of H.R. 1446 address these concerns?

First, Mr. Speaker, my bill provides ongoing authority for the President to negotiate any trade agreement, providing first that he receives approval from Congress in the form of a vote to specifically authorize that negotiation along with its scope and its objectives.

This means that each negotiation can be considered under its own merits and provides for a systemic review by the Congress while there is still some time to affect the outcome.

There will be no more surprises, not for us, and more importantly not for the people we represent.

Under this legislation, 90 days before entering into trade negotiations, the President would formally notify Congress of his intention to proceed. The International Trade Commission would also be required to complete an assessment of the potential impact of the agreement on the U.S. economy.

Legitimate labor and environmental concerns would find voice in this process through the establishment of a Commission on Labor and the Environment. The Commission would issue a report to Congress and the President laying out specific concerns and negotiating objectives prior to the vote by Congress on pre-authorization.

This careful review process allows the Congress to deal with the reality that not all proposed negotiations are created equal.

It is certainly the case that a bilateral trade agreement with Australia would raise very different issues and different concerns than one with Egypt or Laos.

Hemispheric trade proposals may raise labor and environmental concerns which have no relevant place in a negotiation involving financial services or competition policy.

For these reasons, our negotiating strategy and goals must be flexible if we are to maximize the opportunities before us. The law should recognize this reality while still remaining true to our constitutional obligations as a Congress.

Some may attack this proposal because it would require two votes by Congress, not just one, one before a negotiation and one to approve the final agreement. I say so much the better.

The government should speak plainly and honestly to our citizens. Our trade

policy should be shaped in direct consultation with working families throughout the United States, speaking through their elected representatives.

Goals and objectives should be spelled out. Details matter. If we want to restore the faith of Americans in trade agreements, we must be forthright in spelling out our objectives, and we should have nothing to hide.

Pass this legislation and give the administration the authority they need.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

#### TROUBLE IN THE PHILIPPINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the House's attention today to the events that are unfolding in the Philippines, an area that is only 3 hours by flying time to my home island of Guam.

I am troubled by the recent events unraveling in the Philippines in regards to the allegations that the Abu Sayyef, a band of separatists from the southern Philippines, have kidnapped and have killed an American, this is still unconfirmed, and are holding some 20 more people, including two other Americans, as hostages.

I happened to be in Manila on an official visit over the Memorial Day recess when this tragedy occurred. As the lead official from the U.S. at the time in the Philippines, I participated in a number of meetings which were designed to try to help deal with the crisis as well as many other issues that were affecting Philippine-U.S. relations.

Today, I would certainly urge each and every American to continue to support President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo in her heroic and courageous efforts during this very tense standoff. She has made it clear up till now that

she intends to stand firm and not pay any ransom for this most recent rash of kidnappings in her country.

The United States and the Philippines have a very long and proud history of friendship and cooperation, although not always in agreement on each and every issue, thus punctuating the need to continue to work closely with the Philippines in helping them resolve this internal crisis.

I understand that the new administration's, President Bush's administration, strategy review is expected to cast the Asian Pacific region as perhaps the single most important region for military planners. I cannot agree with this renewed focus more. Of course it will bring more attention, not only to my home island of Guam, but to our relationship with the Philippines.

While in Manila, I met with President Arroyo, participated in a series of discussions with Vice President Guingona, who is also concurrently the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, about the implementation of the visiting forces agreement between the U.S. and the Philippines which was formulated in 1999.

□ 1415

This positive step forward hopefully will revive and reinvigorate the security relationship between our two countries, which has declined following the U.S. withdrawal from the military bases there in 1992.

I also drew attention to some of the cleanup issues that are remaining from Clark Air Force Base and Subic Bay Naval Station, formerly U.S. sites, which I also visited. I think it is important that we have a clear understanding of the problems that continue to exist. Last month, the House passed my amendment to the foreign relations authorization bill, which encourages a nongovernmental study to examine environmental contamination and any health effects emanating from these former U.S. facilities. I want to make clear that the United States is not legally required to provide cleanup, but we continue to have a moral obligation to at least investigate and do what we can.

A new study on May 14 by the RAND organization entitled "U.S. and Asia—Toward a New U.S. Strategy and Force Posture" reinforces the current administration's thinking by outlining the importance of an engaged United States in the Asia-Pacific theater. This study argues that the U.S. engage in new relationships with the Philippines and with Guam. Specifically, the study reports that the U.S. should expand cooperation with the Philippines and that the Philippines may present an interesting opportunity to enhance Air Force access in the western Pacific. I could not agree any more with that study.

The Philippines is an important country to the United States, not only because of our long historical relation-

ship but because of our new strategic posture and challenges that we face in this century. I urge all House Members to consider this information and to consider this important piece of our puzzle, our strategy puzzle, in the Asia-Pacific region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROEMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PRESIDENT PROPOSES TO CEASE LIVE COMBINED ARMS TRAINING ON VIEQUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to come to the well today to learn that President Bush is proposing to cease live combined arms training on the Puerto Rican island of Vieques by 2003. In short, the President and his administration are ignoring the issue of military readiness and national security.

In opinion editorials, congressional testimony and official DOD press releases, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General James Jones, and the former Chief of Naval Operation, Jay Johnson, repeatedly stressed to the Clinton administration the importance of combined arms training at Vieques. Their simple and continued message has been very clear: "Without Vieques, the Second Fleet cannot train, evaluate, or certify Battle Group/Amphibious Ready Group teams for combat operations."

In fact, Admiral Johnson testified in a hearing in 1999 that "Vieques is not only the sole training facility on the East Coast that offers crucial combined

live arms training, the range also serves as a model for the world because it offers the ability to conduct actual time synchronization of air, ground, surface, and subsurface components with live ordnance."

Even former President Clinton's special panel on military operations on Vieques concluded that "the separation of certain aspects of current training into their component parts cannot replicate the ideal solution that has been available by the integration of all operational activities at Vieques."

Meanwhile, it appears that this decision will and could perhaps put American men and women at risk in the future. Why? Because it denies them the necessary combined arms training needed to succeed in combat operations. From World War II through our most recent crisis in Kosovo, our Nation's military has been able to meet our Nation's call to arms because of the preparation we afford them at training ranges all over the world but in particular here at Vieques. History has taught us the success or failure of our Nation's military and the risk of loss of life is a direct function of the preparation we afford them prior to combat. Closing the Vieques training range will result in a significant loss of critical combat training, which is essential to our Navy and Marine forces.

Whether it was the Gulf War, that I participated in, or other military operations, we are beginning to dull our own Nation, as if we can place our men and women at risk and somehow, if we are able to conduct these operations with standoff weapons, that there will be no risk of life. We should fall upon our knees and thank the military leaders, those tough NCOs that are out there, those master sergeants, those lieutenants and company commanders who are doing the tough training, because that is what saves lives on the battlefield. And when they train on the ground, it has to be coordinated not only from the sea but also from the air for a combined operation.

I was on the island of Vieques. They need to be able to land the Marines, and the Marines landing need to be able to call in; whether it is naval gunfire, whether it is artillery, or whether calling in from the ship to air, the air to land, but all coordinated on one point. Why? To increase the lethality. Now that sounds brutal, but what is fighting our Nation's wars about? It is bringing lethality to a particular point in time so we can win on the battlefield.

So I am very disappointed that someone down at the White House or others have made judgments without being very good listeners to our military planners, and I appeal, I appeal to the administration to rethink what they have done here. There is absolutely no substitute for training with live ammunition. Do not succumb to the temptation that live fire combined with arms training on Vieques can be duplicated elsewhere or overemphasize simulation