States to negotiate such agreements and jeopardize our leadership role in the world. I support H.R. 2621 because I am deeply concerned about the long-term damage this would cause to our economy and to jobs in my district and around this country. Passage of this important legislation would help us ensure we remain leaders in the global economy.

ADDRESS OF LT. GEN. ROGER G. THOMPSON, JR.

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 65, I rise today to bring to my colleagues attention the U.S. military's belief in a strong domestic maritime industry, as well affirmed in a speech last month before the national convention of the Propeller Club by Lt. Gen. Roger Thompson, the deputy commander in chief of the U.S. Transportation Command.

In his remarks, General Thompson reaffirmed support for the Jones Act as a ''proven performer that supported both our nation's military security and its economic soundness,'' further commenting that the cabotage law ''provides its root structure for our strategic transoceanic sealift capabilities.'' In recognizing the valuable insurance the Jones Act fleet presents to the Defense Department, General Thompson noted that 75 percent of ocean going Jones Act vessels of over 1,000 gross tons are militarily useful and some 89,000 domestic mariners are qualified to crew the Government's Ready Reserve Force.

With your approval, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place the full text of his address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. ROGER G. THOMPSON, JR.

It's a pleasure to be here today . . . Admiral Siler, Mr. Joseph, Mr. Myrick, Mr. Bazemore, ladies and gentlemen—no . . . let me make that ''our friends in the Propeller Club of the United States . . . because today we are indeed, all among friends.

It's a wonderful opportunity to be here today with all of you—here in the magnificent city of Savannah. Certainly it's a fitting place for this conclave. It is at the same time rooted deeply in the rich history of our South Atlantic coast and its equally rich maritime traditions; currently of course, a thriving port both for commercial and military activity; and a strategic shipping and logistics location poised to continue its critical economic and military importance unhesitatingly into the 21st century.

I have a particular relationship with Savannah, because in the mid 80s I was stationed in Charleston, SC, in the Military Traffic Management Command, and I was the port commander and our responsibilities were for the entire Southeast coast, so all Department of Defense Cargo that moved through the Southeastern ports was my responsibility. And I spent a lot of hours down on the waterfront at both ocean terminals and of course, the city, where we loaded day and night some ships that were deploying around the world our combat ships for various missions, mostly, I thank goodness, for exercises as opposed to major crises. So I have a lot of days and nights in the Savannah waterfront area.

So it is a pleasure for me to be here today to represent the United States Transportation Command.

A brief word about the Transportation Command . . . it is a joint command, that is part of the Department of Defense. And as a joint command it has three components.

There is the Military Traffic Management Command that is primarily in charge of surface transportation and intermodal transportation . . . and there is Air Mobility Command, which is of course just what the name implies. It provides our airlift, and makes arrangements not only with organic airlift, but also with commercial aircraft . . . and finally there is the Military Sealift Command, with which I'm sure you are very familiar, which is responsible for our over ocean transportation. So that is a quick snap shot of the United States Transportation Command's organization. In total numbers, with active military, civilian and reserve, we have about 163,000 folks who are responsible for orchestrating the Defense Transportation System.

I need to tell you, that since my arrival some six weeks ago at USTRANSCOM, my primarily Army background—although it has included extensive port operations and other involvement with maritime operations—has broadened tremendously. Of course, much of what we do in the military is underpinned by slanguage and jargon—and among other skills, I've been learning additional seagoing terminology! So this story kind of tells how I am learning, and you can be the judge of whether I am learning well, or not.

I was told in my first days at TRANSCOM about a wizened World War II merchant skipper. He was renowned not just for open ocean navigation acumen but especially for his restricted harbor situation maneuvering skills. In fact, he seldom used tugs. But every morning when he arrived on the bridge, he unlocked a drawer, peered into it quickly, concentrated, shut the drawer and then locked it.

As luck would have it, after navigating the worlds oceans for decades, dodging enemy subs and bombers, the aging mariner passed away quietly in his bunk. When the boatswain found him in the morning, although somewhat hesitant, he quickly grabbed the now deceased captain's keys and rushed to the bridge. Breathlessly opening the lock and peering into the drawer, he saw a yellowed, frazzled, neatly lettered: ''Port is Left . . . Starboard is Right.'' So I just want you to know I'm learning.

So I know my left from right now, and I've also learned a little about where the word ''posh'' came from. When I was growing up I thought the word ''posh'' meant elegant. I thought I'd learned my lessons, but wrong . . . it's really a nautical term and derives the sea trade routes between Great Britain and its former Indian subcontinent colonies. In the days before air conditioning, transiting the Mediterranean in the summer, and then the Indian Ocean near the equator, one wanted to be on the north, or left side of the ship, deriving such comfort from the shade as might be possible.

On the return voyage—of course—you wanted again to be on the north, or this time, the starboard side. Thus, using England as a point of reference, the best cabins were on the Port side Outbound, and to the Starboard side coming Home—Port Outbound . . . Starboard Home . . . P-O-S-H . . posh. So I'm learning all kinds of things in my new job.

But I'd like now to shift my course, and talk about the subject of this gathering in Savannah—America's Maritime Lifeline—The Jones Act.

The purpose that has been most commonly ascribed to the Jones Act is of course, the requirement that domestic waterborne commerce—shipping between two points in our nation—shall be conducted in U.S.-crewed and flagged vessels.

Frankly, if that's as far as it went, we at USTRANSCOM probably would not be terribly concerned with its future. We see little prospect of any need to transport our 3rd Armored Division from Beaumont to Boston. We sincerely hope that the unpleasantness some 130 years ago is indeed behind us forever.

And so if I may draw an analogy, if the Jones Act was a tree, the domestic maritime shipment issue would be a trunk—a main structure. But the roots that support that trunk also support another trunk—the strategic sealift that gives our nation much of its capability to project power overseas.

The Jones Act, conceived some 80 years ago as a measure to ensure our domestic maritime base, just as assuredly provides its root structure for our strategic transoceanic sealift capabilities. The Jones Act is truly a ''win-win package'' for our country.

Before I more closely examine the strategic sealift ramifications of the Jones Act, I might note that this is not an exclusive piece of protectionist legislation to favor our nation, nor is it unlike laws that support other forms of commercial road, rail and air transportation in the United States. On the contrary, cabotage laws—derived from the French word, Caboter—which means to sail along the coast or ''by the capes''—are in various forms, the laws of some 56 nations around the world.

Now I'd like to state for the record, that the domestic maritime industry is not some small potatoes special interest group.

Our domestic maritime industry employs some 124,000 taxpayers, either serving in the vessels or in shipbuilding, repair and of course many other related fields, with which you all are very familiar.

The private investment in U.S.-flag domestic shipping investment exceeds $26 billion for some 44,000 vessels and barges.

Domestic shipping moves 30% of United States' cargo at a cost of less than 2% of our nation's total freight bill.

Having clearly defined left from right, port from starboard—just what do our nation's military, strategic sealift interests derive from this piece of domestic legislation? The question is—ladies and gentleman—Where's the ''beef'' for USTRANSCOM?

Surely it has not in recent history been the actual military employment of vessels. During Operations desert Shield and Desert Storm, only 2 of 22 militarily useful dry cargo vessels and 6 of 99 Jones Act Tankers were employed. Although I might add, these 6 tankers delivered more than 20% of U.S. tanker petroleum products deliveries in the course of 40 voyages. But we should never forget the tremendous potential here. We should remember that 75% of ocean going Jones Act vessels of over 1,000 gross tons are militarily useful, as defined by Department of Defense. They in themselves are valuable insurance.

But these vessels don't have to sail to foreign ports to serve our nation, and you know that. Great Lakes ships and inland river barges are vital conduits that move cargoes from the interior of our nation to coastal ports for shipment overseas. And throughout, they contribute to and support our great nation's economy.

Perhaps the most critical contribution of the Jones Act to Desert Shield-Desert Storm activity was the crewmembers—the American merchant mariners—who sailed our Ready Reserve Force of Vessels in harm's way, delivering the tracked and wheeled vehicles, the sustaining supplies, that enabled the United States and its coalition partners

to pulverize Iraq in a 30-day war and then roll over it in a 100 hour ground war.

The Iraqis threatened to mine the seas. The U.S. merchant mariners sailed into the theater at best speed.

The Iraqis threatened to use chemical weapons. What did the U.S. mariners do? They ignored the threats and delivered their cargoes anyhow.

And when the war was concluded victoriously—and we had lots and lots of stuff left over there—and by the way, lots of it was ammunition—U.S. merchant mariners brought the equipment and supplies home.

Of the citizen mariners who crew Jones Act Vessels, some 8,000 are qualified to crew the government's fleet of Ready Reserve Force—or RRF—vessels in time of national need. These 90-plus RRF vessels—designed or modified to carry the outsized and heavy equipment and cargoes that characterize our military force—are core elements of our nation's strategic sealift capabilities.

More recently mariners who work domestic vessels—and in the case of our mission in Haiti, the vessels themselves—have played significant roles. When we activated Ready Reserve Force ships to support Operation JOINT ENDEAVOR in Bosnia, fully 70% of the crews that answered the call had been employed in our domestic fleet—Jones Act vessels—during the five years between the Gulf conflict and operations in Bosnia.

Next, the Jones Act is important to the United States military because it supports a U.S. shipbuilding capability that has turned a corner in recent years, with tonnage under construction increasing to the level that elevates this country from 22nd in the world to 8th.

And the act supports a maritime repair and maintenance capability that might be critical if we were to find ourselves in a protracted conflict and be obliged—as we have been in the past—to repair damaged or worn sealift assets.

Some folks have called the Jones Act a legislative life-support system for an aging, dying creature. I would like to note that over the past three decades:

America's domestic fleet—vessels exceeding 1,000 tons gross weight tonnage—doubled in numbers from 1965 to 95

. . . it tripled productivity during that same period, and

. . . reached the one billion ton cargo threshold for the first time in 1995.

Now I guess I've got to ask you—and myself at the same time—do we hear any death rattles in those statistics. I certainly don't hear any.

And Jones Act vessels are part of our newest initiative—VISA—the Voluntary Intermodal Sealift Agreement, implemented only this year following its development with MARAD.

Many of you here are members of organizations which are participating in the groundbreaking initiative . . . and we want to thank you for your support.

VISA is very similar to the highly successful Civil Reserve Air Fleet—or CRAF—that has served our nation's military airlift needs so well.

VISA—like the Jones Act—is another win-win construct, DOD gains capacity—access actually to capacity—intermodal capacity—vice specific hulls. Contracts are being prenegotiated: we will know what we will have to pay; carriers will know what they will get.

And this is a very important point, we are planning jointly with our industry partners. And I might add on the side, that this planning has received national recognition and the people that have been part of this planning group for the last two years, have been recent recipients of the hammer award. This joint planning means industry representatives—that have security clearances—sit with us as we develop war plans. Now that's unprecedented. And their inputs and suggestions are proving extraordinarily valuable to us. So we are very excited about that.

Industry is learning ahead of time what we will need, which in turn enables them to project accurately and protect their market share. We are not just getting access to specific ships, as I mentioned a minute ago, we are getting access to worldwide intermodal system capacity and expertise. And as you know, by watching what has been going on in the intermodal world, this has become much much more important than even in the past.

I know of few military people—and virtually none who have experienced it—who would seek the opportunity for military confrontation or combat. But as you know, the odds and history don't offer much hope that total peace will break out anytime soon or for long.

Air lift is swift—to be sure. It can move personnel and high priority cargo around the world in only hours. Along with long-range air strikes. It gives us awesome halting power to stop an aggressor's advance. But to mount and sustain a counter attack and drive to victory—as far as we can see into the future—still will require strategic sealift.

Sealift will move the bulk of the unit equipment—what are we talking about?—the tanks, artillery and trucks—that will ultimately uproot an aggressor and defeat him. And it will deliver the sustaining supplies to carry the day. Fully 90 to 95% of all war materials and supplies will be delivered by sealift.

So for the reasons cited—the Jones Act is an important element supporting that requirement. It provides a very important root system that sustains our sealift capability.

In conclusion, the Jones Act is a proven performer that supports both our nation's military security and its economic soundness.

I'd like to thank you for inviting me here today. And I certainly wish you all the best of success with this session that you are having here, but more importantly I wish you continued success in your fields so we can continue making our great nation even greater and even stronger.

FAST TRACK AUTHORITY

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997, which would provide fast-track authority to the President. While I believe free trade is important, I do not believe Congress should just turn over our constitutional authority on trade to the President whenever he asks. The current version of H.R. 2621 is more restrictive than the past legislation which enabled Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton to negotiate GATT and NAFTA.

Congress must ensure that labor and environmental standards can be raised in the context of trade issues. With increased globalization, these issues are becoming interrelated. Unfortunately, there has been a trend within the executive branch of the United States to delink trade policy with other important foreign policy goals like promotion of fair labor standards, elimination of child labor, improvement in environmental conditions, and the promotion of human rights.

Trade policy has in some cases become the No. 1 priority, with other important issues being put on the back burner and receiving less attention. One such example was the United States willingness to impose trade sanctions against the Chinese for their violation of international standards on intellectual property rights. However, the administration was unwilling to impose sanctions because of restrictions on religious freedom in China which also violated international law. This is not consistent policy.

Mr. Speaker, I review trade agreements on a case by case basis and how they will affect jobs in my district. I supported the Uruguay round of the GATT because I thought it was a good deal for the United States. I opposed NAFTA because I did not think it was the best deal we could have gotten. I argued then that we needed to have high standards for NAFTA because it would be expanded to include Latin and South America. If we pass this version of fast track, the administration could easily expand some of the flawed provisions of NAFTA.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would vote for the President to have expedited trade negotiating authority only if it includes authority to improve labor, environmental, and human rights standards. If fast track fails, the administration still has authority to negotiate trade agreements. The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement was negotiated without fast track and the Uruguay round of the GATT proceeded for several years without fast track. The United States must take its time to negotiate good trade agreements which will benefit our businesses, our workers, and represent our values.

COMMENDING KEN ENNS OF ENNS PACKING

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Ken Enns and his company, Enns Packing, who have made major contributions to the underprivileged people of California.

Ken has a strong history of support for California Emergency Foodlink which is a nonprofit organization that provides food to the hungry throughout California. In 1992, his company was a major donor to Foodlink's Donate-Don't Dump program. Donate-Don't Dump assists the U.S. Department of Agriculture's community program by providing private food donations. Enns Packing offered added support to this program in 1997 when it donated close to 3 million pounds of fresh fruit.

Ken and Enns Packing give fresh produce to help feed 1.5 million needy Californians each month during the summer. Ken has also been instrumental in encouraging companies similar to his to support Foodlink. His efforts resulted in Foodlink's distribution of over 32 million pounds of donated food in 1996.

Ken's philanthropy has contributed greatly to help feed the hungry people of California. I congratulate Ken and Enns Packing on their