

Palmer, a former pastor of the Patchogue Congregational Church, and H. Judson Overton. It was renamed the Patchogue Advance. Reverend Palmer stayed for only a few issues and sold out to Mr. Overton, who became its sole proprietor and editor.

On May 18, 1888, he sold out to Martin Van Deusen, who continued its policies and increased its circulation to the four-figure mark. He operated the paper until June 25, 1892, when James A. Canfield, of Hudson, MI, took over the helm. Since then it has remained in his family for 103 years. Under his proprietorship, the newspaper grew and prospered, playing a larger part in community affairs, and sometimes even leading many issues of the town.

In 1924, John T. Tuthill, Jr., Mr. Canfield's son-in-law, became publisher upon the death of Mr. Canfield. He was publisher for 48 years, except for a stint in the Navy during World War II where he rose to the rank of captain. In the post-war years, the Advance was one of three of the largest and most influential weekly newspapers in Suffolk County. The other two being the News-Review of Riverhead, published by Frank C. Forbes, my own uncle, and the Long Islander of Huntington. In 1972, Captain Tuthill's son, John T. Tuthill III, became publisher upon Captain Tuthill's death. Today, he remains the Advance's publisher.

Congratulations to the Long Island Advance. May it continue to serve the community for hundreds of years to come.

TRADE AND JOBS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 7, 1996, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TRADE AND JOBS

Hoosiers have different perspectives on foreign trade. Some are concerned that imports of cheap goods and services and the relocation of U.S. companies to other countries help keep U.S. wages down and eliminate good jobs. They want the U.S. to take steps to limit foreign competition. Others think trade creates jobs and boosts growth by opening new markets for our goods and services. They want the United States to take better advantage of export opportunities in other countries.

Both perspectives have some merit. Trade has a number of benefits for jobs and the economy, while trade and plant relocation can also suppress wages and cost jobs. But regardless of where they stand on trade, most Hoosiers would agree that our goal should be to minimize the harm of trade and maximize the benefits. The private sector and governments must work together to help firms take advantage of opportunities created by trade while assisting workers who are adversely affected by it.

BENEFITS AND COSTS OF TRADE

Exporting to other countries supports jobs at home—several million, by most estimates. Imports of goods and services expand choices for consumers and help keep domestic prices down. But workers are sometimes innocent victims of trade developments and other economic forces over which they have little control. While some plants in Indiana have

added jobs due to increased exports in recent years, others have laid off workers because of competition from lower-wage countries in Latin America and Asia.

Although the primary responsibility rests with the private sector, I do think federal, state and local governments can help firms and workers respond to both the opportunities and the challenges of trade.

HELPING FIRMS

When U.S. firms sell more goods and services in foreign markets, the job security and wages of their workers generally increase. The State of Indiana and the federal government each manage a variety of programs that help firms identify and take advantage of export opportunities.

The Indiana Department of Commerce gives Hoosier businesses specialized advice on how to crack key export markets. It also helps firms participate in international trade shows where they can pitch Indiana products to new foreign customers. The federal government runs several cost-effective export-promotion programs. Every dollar spent promoting exports of manufactured goods contributes to sales that produce an estimated \$10 in tax revenues for the Treasury.

U.S. export-promotion programs were streamlined in 1993 and 1994. Overlap among programs was reduced, coordination was improved, and services to small businesses were upgraded. These changes saved operating expenses. And, as Hoosier executives have told me, they also made the programs more effective in generating export sales.

Last year I opposed the unsuccessful effort in Congress to abolish certain export-promotion programs and to cut the budgets of those that survived by 25%. Most other exporting nations already spend more proportionally than we do on export promotion. These short-sighted cuts would have amounted to unilateral disarmament by the U.S. in the international competition for export sales. I will continue to oppose measures that could reduce our ability to expand our share of world markets and create new opportunities for U.S. workers.

HELPING WORKERS

Job training, vocational education, and income assistance can help workers in several ways. By upgrading job skills, training can boost the wages and job security of U.S. workers who compete with foreign workers. For workers whose jobs have already been lost, training can open the door to careers in industries that are flourishing. Temporary income assistance can help laid-off workers make ends meet while they pursue job training and education.

The State of Indiana and the federal government both run programs designed to help workers respond to the challenges and opportunities of trade. In addition to backing a range of vocational education efforts, the state provides special job training services to workers confronting serious foreign competition. These programs are often run through Ivy Tech vocational schools, which work closely with companies to identify worker skills most in demand.

The federal Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program offers three kinds of help to workers whose jobs are lost due to imports: training, job-search counseling, and income assistance for six to twelve months beyond the expiration of state unemployment benefits. In 1995 TAA provided \$212 million in income assistance for 39,000 workers and \$130 million in training for 33,000 workers.

We need to do a better job of helping American workers get a leg up on foreign competition. Most of the world's other major economic powers provide more help to trade-impacted workers than we do. TAA only helps

workers after their jobs have been lost due to imports, and it doesn't help workers laid off because jobs were shifted to other countries. The track record of TAA is also mixed. Many recipients of TAA benefits do not land jobs that pay better than the ones they lost.

Responding to these concerns, the President in 1994 proposed in overhaul of dozens of federal job training programs, including TAA. The idea was to create a single, streamlined program that would help any worker whose job was jeopardized or lost due to trade or other changes in the economy. Workers would be given vouchers worth several thousand dollars that they could use to help pay the cost of the job training or vocational education program of their choice.

Unfortunately, improving U.S. worker training programs has not been a priority of the Gingrich-led House, which has sometimes been willing to let workers fend for themselves in the face of stiff international competition. Work on the President's proposal ground to a halt in 1995. Instead of trying to work with the President to strengthen TAA and other worker training initiatives, congressional leaders have tried to cut funding.

CONCLUSION

With foreign competition growing, we should be increasing, not decreasing, our investment in workers. Improving the skills of our workforce is among the most important things we can do as a nation. Working with the private sector, Congress and the President must take steps to help U.S. workers retain jobs and wages before they are lost, and prepare for the new jobs that our economy creates.

TRIBUTE TO DICK FIFIELD

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1996

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dick Fifield who is retiring after 22 years of dedicated service with the Alabama Farmers Federation. I have known Dick for many years and I consider him to be one of the strongest advocates of farm programs in the country. He has fought for the small family farmer and his leadership on behalf of Alabama farmers will be missed.

Dick is a native of Wisconsin who began his career in agriculture with a degree from Beloit College in 1951, followed by an MS in horticulture from the University of Illinois in 1972. He served his country as a member of the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps as a special agent from 1951 to 1954, and taught at the University of Illinois from 1971 to 1974 as an assistant horticulturist before moving to Alabama and joining the Alabama Farmers Federation in 1974.

As director of horticulture, poultry and forestry, Dick designed the federation's monthly food price survey and began annual farm market days in Birmingham, Huntsville, and Montgomery. He established and operated a producer-farmer market inside a shopping mall in Birmingham, a new and innovative idea at the time. Dick played a leading role in the design and construction of the Alabama State Farmers' Market, built in 1984.

As director of natural and environmental resources at the Farmers Federation, Dick Fifield worked with farmers to promote optimum employment of their land resources.