the preservation of the heritage of our community. It is with great pride that I congratulate the staff and members of the Sandy Spring Museum as well as the entire community as they celebrate their achievements and the heritage of their community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2000

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I missed the following recorded votes due to funeral services for my father. I wish the RECORD to reflect how I would have voted on the following had I been present:

No. 587, H.J. Res. 122: Passage of Continuing Appropriations for FY2000, ''aye''; No. 588, Motion regarding House Meeting Hour for November 2, 2000, ''aye''; No. 589, H. Con. Res. 397: Passage of resolution voicing concern about serious human rights violations and fundamental freedoms in Central Asia, ''aye''; No. 590, H.R. 4577: Passage of Holt motion to instruct conferees on Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, FY 2001, ''no''; No. 591, H.R. 4577: Passage of Wu motion to instruct conferees on Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, FY2001, ''no''; No. 592, H.J. Res. 123: Passage of Continuing Appropriations for FY 2000, ''aye''; No. 594, S. 2796: Passage of Water Resources Development Act of 2000 Conference Report, ''aye''.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBEN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2000

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on November 2, I was away from the House and missed one vote. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: Roll No. 592, Further Continuing Appropriations—''yea.''

FINANCIAL TIMES

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to bring the following insightful opinion piece from the November 1, 2000, edition of the Financial Times to the attention of his colleagues. Written by Mr. Jagdish Bhagwati, the Andre Meyer senior fellow in international economics at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, this commentary accurately describes the weak record of the current Administration over the past eight years in achieving needed comprehensive trade liberalization. It then forcefully identifies the disturbing consequences for further liberalization, which is beneficial to the United States and the international trading system, should Mr. GORE win the presidency. I submit the following article into the RECORD.

DISCRIMINATION DISGUISED AS FREE TRADE

A Democratic Victory in the Presidential Election Would Bring Disturbing Consequences for Liberalization, Argues Jagdish Bhagwati

Many card-carrying Democrats among America's trade experts are unable to make up their minds as the day approaches when they must cast their vote for George W. Bush or Al Gore.

When they think of social issues, the Supreme Court vacancies to be filled and spending on liberal programmes, they turn to Mr. Gore. But when they think of the Clinton-Gore administration's record on trade policy and of what Mr. Gore promises to do, they sit up and shudder.

The unpleasant reality is that the outcome of the election has huge implications—disturbing under Mr. Gore and comforting under Mr. Bush—for trade liberalisation and the trading system.

Start with the current administration's record. True, the White House saw through both the Uruguay round of trade talks and the North American Free Trade Agreement. But while the administration fought hard and well—as indeed a Republican administration would have done—both were Republican initiatives that the present administration inherited when they were already at an advanced stage. Furthermore, the real heroes who delivered the majority votes were Republicans.

The Democratic administration's only home-grown success has been with Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. But the deal was entirely one-sided, with China giving the U.S. everything on market access and the U.S. giving China nothing but entry into the World Trade Organization.

The Democratic team passed off these deals as a great victory for the US and for free trade. But no amount of spin can hide the ineptitude that led to the first ever failure in 1997 by a US administration to get fast-track authority renewed by Congress: Bill Clinton managed to bring only a fifth of House Democrats on board to vote for renewal.

Nor can one forget or forgive the debacle in Seattle last year when a deadly mix of mismanagement and calculated cynicism—pandering to the labour unions with an eye to the elections—dashed hopes of launching a new round of multilateral trade negotiations and brought the WTO into unmerited disrepute.

Underlying these failures, and prospective problems under a Gore presidency, are two legacies of this administration: surrender to the notion that free trade requires ''fair trade''; and a capitulation to labour unions that fair trade requires market access to be conditional on a social clause at the WTO on fulfilment of labour standards, now tactically defined as ''workers' rights''.

The rise of fair trade owes much to the first Clinton-Gore administration's fixation with Japan. Bent on branding Japan as an ''unfair trader'' and going for high-profile but fruitless confrontations such as the car dispute, the administration made ''unfair trade'' a favoured tactic in the political domain.

The labour lobbies have been smart enough to adapt their demands accordingly. For decades they have worried about foreign competition and outflow of investment, especially in labour-intensive goods such as apparel and shoes. Now, they have a great new argument: unless labour standards elsewhere are similar to those in the US, trade is unfair and must be stopped. This way, you get on to higher moral ground. You also do so in the battle over markets. If poor countries accept the demands, their costs should rise and the competition will be reduced. By contrast, if they do not their exports will be cut off. This is a cynical game where governments that badly need support from the labour unions even as they turn to the ''third way'' see domestic political gain in caving in to these demands. The Clinton-Gore team—unlikely Tony Blair's British government—is no stranger to this tactic. Last week's announcement of a free trade agreement with Jordan—with labour and environmental standards stipulated in the text—left John Sweeney of the AFL–CIO trade union jubilant and fired up for the election. Charlene Barshefsky, the US trade representative, has called it a ''template'' for all trade treaties by the US.

Only a significant power would have the hubris or the chutzpah to present a trade agreement with a monarchy essentially dependent on the US, with a minuscule trade volume, as a model for the rest of the world to emulate.

But that Al Gore thinks so is certain. Indeed, his policy statements and the Democratic platform are unambiguous: no trade liberalisation without such preconditions. If so, we can forget the WTO where nothing but a big north-south divide will follow, as it did in Seattle largely as a result of this issue.

And so, under Mr. Gore, Washington will contemplate more templates with inconsequential performers, multilateral trade liberalisation will languish, and the WTO will atrophy as the world is plagued by yet more inherently preferential free trade agreements masquerading as genuine non-discriminatory free trade. Is this what we deserve?

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 2000

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the respected representative of Nebraska's Third Congressional District, the Honorable BILL BARRETT, is retiring from this House at the end of the 106th Congress. BILL has served five productive and distinguished terms in this House. I know that BILL's presence here in Congress will be sorely missed. I wish BILL the best of luck in the coming years. The gain of Lexington, Nebraska is a loss for this body and the American people.

BILL BARRETT was elected in 1990 and his constituents have sent him back every election since, and by resounding margins I might add. As Chairman of the Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation and Credit Agriculture Subcommittee, BILL has served not only the needs of his mainly rural Nebraska constituents, but the needs of farmers across the nation. In 1996 BILL was instrumental in passing the Federal Agriculture Improvement Reform Act or FAIR Act—legislation authorizing the majority of U.S. agricultural programs until 2002. And BILL has been a leader in his efforts to improve education in rural communities across the United States, particularly as a respected Member of the Education and the Workforce Committee. BILL's hard work and dedication on Agricultural matters will be missed, he leaves some very large shoes to fill come January.

Then there is the matter of our resemblance. Some have claimed that BILL and I are