However notable Durham Manufacturing's products are, what is more important is the feeling of family and community fostered by the company. Durham is as dedicated to its employees as it is to its customers. As a result, several members of families work together at Durham and in some cases generations of families have been employed there.

This kind of company loyalty has helped keep Durham successful. As everyone gathers to celebrate the 75th anniversary, Durham is a leader in the metal packaging industry.

I am very pleased to congratulate Durham on its 75th anniversary and I am hopeful that there will be many more.

NAFTA PARITY FOR U.S. WOOL APPAREL INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1997

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that will redress a wrong inflicted on an important segment of the U.S. textile and apparel industry during NAFTA negotiations. I believe it is important for the credibility of NAFTA to correct a serious flaw in this agreement that has adversely and unfairly affected U.S. textile and apparel producers.

During NAFTA negotiations with Canada, changes were made in the original United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement [CFTA] with respect to imports of men's and boys' wool suits, jackets and slacks—changes which both injure United States manufacturers in this sector and give no avenue for relief from this injury. My legislation will correct this mistake and return to provisions that were originally in the CFTA.

When the United States and Canada negotiated the textile and apparel provisions of the CFTA, special duty allowances were made for tailored men's and boys' wool apparel made from foreign fabric, that is, fabric not produced in either the United States or Canada. According to CFTA rules of origin, wool apparel could qualify for CFTA tariffs only if both the apparel and fabric originated in Canada or the United States. Because Canada claimed a shortage of wool fabric, a temporary Tariff Preference Level [TPL] was established for this category of imported apparel for items made from textiles that were not available in either the United States or Canada—hence, the special treatment for wool apparel made from non-United States or Canadian textiles.

At the time, Canadian manufacturers of tailored wool apparel constituted only a small portion of the Canadian apparel industry, and the TPL was intended only to ensure that they had an adequate supply of wool fabric. Moreover, Canadian negotiators refused to set sublimits for categories of wool apparel in response to United States concerns about concentration of products. Canada explicitly assured the United States that it would never allow targeting of products, and Canada would continue shipping a wide range of products. The CFTA mandated renegotiation of the Tariff Preference Level by January 1, 1998, according to changing conditions and circumstances of the market.

During NAFTA negotiations, textiles and apparel issues with Canada remained unresolved until the end of negotiations in August 1992, even though agreement with Mexico had been reached 4 months earlier. A deal was struck at the last minute that would have a major impact on U.S. industry. First, preference levels increased slightly, but a sublimit for wool suits was set at 99 percent of the TPL and effectively was not a sublimit.

Second, the CFTA monitoring and renegotiation requirements were dropped that would have made adjustments to ''reflect current conditions in the textile and apparel industries.'' Indeed, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative has said that NAFTA negotiations constituted a fulfillment of the CFTA mandate.

The result of this retention of Tariff Preference Levels—and indeed the increase of levels rather than a lowering—has resulted in an unacceptable surge in imports of this product from Canada. United States industry believes this provision has been used by Canadian producers for ''wholesale circumvention of the rule of origin''—and the rule of origin is the foundation of a free trade agreement. The legislation I am introducing today would restore the mandate to monitor and renegotiate the schedule of Tariff Preference Levels by January 1, 1998.

Since 1988, the surge of tailored wool apparel imports from Canada has devastated the United States industry. U.S. production of men's and boys' wool suits has dropped more than 40 percent, and employment has fallen almost 50 percent. At the time of CFTA negotiations, United States industry voiced concern about establishing Tariff Preference Levels for goods made from nonoriginating fabric, but Canada assured United States negotiators that preexisting trade patterns would not be altered. Clearly, this has not happened.

Yet, U.S. industry does not normal access to safeguard actions as provided in other sections of NAFTA which would allow it to petition the U.S. Government for temporary relief from injurious imports. Instead, the wool apparel industry was excluded from NAFTA safeguard action because CFTA provisions were retained instead that reserved the Parties rights under GATT—but did not address quantitative restrictions. This reliance on GATT—now the WTO—only for the U.S. textile and apparel industry in turn imposes limitations on the use of safeguards because of U.S. legislation recognizing the phasehout of the Multifiber Agreement. The effect gives the U.S. wool apparel industry no recourse to safeguard action—a situation that no U.S. trade agreement has allowed in the past.

Even more glaring in the NAFTA is the specific omission of allowed consultations between the United States and Canada for surges of United States imports for wool products entering the United States under quantitative restrictions. The legislation I am introducing would allow the U.S. industry for tailored wool apparel to have normal access to safeguard provisions under the NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Congress must take corrective action when it becomes aware that a major piece of legislation unfairly excludes and injures a sector of U.S. industry, especially when this effect was not intended. We owe it to U.S. workers in the tailored wool apparel sector to restore legislation to its original intent and to provide for a normal avenue under U.S. trade law to redress injury from imports.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. RENEGOTIATION OF QUANTITIES OF WOOL ARTICLES ELIGIBLE FOR TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVELS.

By not later than January 1, 1998, the President shall take the necessary steps to renegotiate with Canada the annual quantity limitations of tailored wool apparel assembled in Canada from fabric or yarn produced or obtained in a country other than a NAFTA country, that is eligible for preferential tariff treatment under Appendix 6.B.1 to Annex 300–B of the NAFTA, to reflect current conditions in the wool textile and apparel industry located in Canada and the United States, including the ability of tailored wool apparel producers to obtain supplies of wool fabric within the territories of Canada and the United States.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF SAFEGUARD PROCEDURES.

For purposes of part 1 of subtitle A of title III of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3351) and following)—

(1) the term ''Canadian article'' shall be deemed to include tailored wool apparel assembled in Canada from fabric or yarn produced or obtained in a country other than a NAFTA country, that is eligible for preferential tariff treatment under Appendix 6.B.1 to Annex 300–B of the NAFTA; and

(2) subsection (d)(2) of section 302 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3352(d)(2)) shall not apply to articles described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term ''NAFTA'' means the North American Free Trade Agreement approved by the Congress under section 101(a) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3311(a)); and

(2) the term ''NAFTA country'' has the meaning given that term in section 2(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3301(2)).

A TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN YOUTH SOCCER ORGANIZATION

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the American Youth Soccer program for its contributions toward promoting athletic activities among children in our community. It is a great honor to rise on behalf of all of those involved in youth soccer.

The American Youth Soccer Organization is an extremely important nonprofit corporation dedicated to promoting youth soccer in our community. This soccer program keeps our kids off the streets, promotes their self-esteem, and puts our children's minds and bodies to work. Both our community and our children profit from this league.

I believe the American Youth Soccer Organization's motto ''everyone plays'' describes the nurturing environment that this organization strives to provide our children on the soccer field. I am proud to represent and honor an organization that encourages all of our

youth to play soccer no matter what abilities they possess.

Finally, the success of the American Youth Soccer Organization would not be possible without its wonderful volunteers. I commend the patience and dedication of all of those who are involved as players, coaches, referees, and spectators.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the contributions the American Youth Soccer Organization has made to our community. The American Youth Soccer Organization serves as an example for other youth soccer leagues across our Nation.

SARAH GEVING: A STORY OF WORK, FAMILY, AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1997

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Sarah Geving, a constituent of California's 51st Congressional District, has written a personal account about growing up on welfare. Her real-life story shows how the old welfare system encouraged complacency, bred hopelessness, and trapped many families in a cycle of welfare dependency. Sarah's experience taught her that the best way to break free of the welfare trap was not to give people a handout, but to give them a hand up.

Our new welfare reform law does that. It encourages work, family, and personal responsibility, giving people hope and a better chance at the American dream. I am proud to have played a part in reforming the failed welfare system and to share Sarah's story with my colleagues by entering it into the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States:

AN AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY

(By Sarah Geving)

My parents got divorced when I was four years old and we went on welfare shortly after that. We were on welfare for the next eight years. Why did we continue to receive hand-outs from the government for nearly a decade? Because the government kept sending them. Was my mom physically disabled during this time? No, or she would have been on physician ordered ''disability.'' And long-term disability at that! The U.S. government enabled my mother to stay home for eight years.

My mom dropped out of high school in the eleventh grade. Do you think that during the years the government ''helped'' to take care of us, they encouraged my mom to go back and get her G.E.D.? No. Did they encourage her to attend technical schools so that she would be prepared to enter the job market? No. They should have at least required her to go back and finish high school or get her G.E.D.

When my mom decided to get a job, of course she was totally unprepared in terms of skills, so she had to take a minimum wage job. With welfare reform, we must teach people to progress. Education should be encouraged so that families are not struggling for food as we were. This does not mean that I think we should be working to raise minimum wage. I do not. We should be encouraging work, education, and the spirit of volunteerism. Since my family was so poor even when my mom went back to work, we relied on church donations, donations from anonymous people, and when all else failed, we stood in line for food. As demeaning as this was, we did eat. Americans are generous and the private sector will help with welfare reform. If we encourage hard work and education, children will not have to grow up feeling ashamed like I did. Families who are experiencing hard times and are struggling for food need to be counseled to make better choices. Volunteers should not only help provide food, but they should also help people make better choices. Better choices means that poverty will be temporary, not generational.

When I stood in line for food it was hurtful emotionally. I was embarrassed. I didn't want my friends at school to know about my true private life. I spent years feeling ashamed. One thing that did help was having a ''Big Brother''. A friend of a friend wanted to volunteer as a big brother. Instead of going through an agency and being hooked up with a young boy, this mutual friend hooked him up with me. He was a good example for me because he worked for a living and he gave me advice about college. He treated me like I was a person. My home life was not good and it was helpful to spend time with someone stable once in awhile. We must encourage ''big brothers'' and ''big sisters''.

My mom had a lot of problems and often could not take care of us. She could have given us over to the State for awhile. She needed foster homes for us. Instead, her church found temporary homes for us until my mom could take us back. My sister and I think we lived in at least nine different homes. If we had been in State foster care, we probably would not have been able to stay in the same part of town and the same school district. Since stability was always lacking, at least we could stay in the same school. Once again, this illustrates the importance of individuals and the idea of volunteerism.

If I had gotten pregnant at 17 or 18, the government would have been willing to support me and how ever many children I may have had. I was definitely an ''at risk'' child. I believe that one of the things that saved me was help from people—not the government, but individual people.

Private enterprise, individual people, and volunteerism will be crucial in implementing welfare reform. Ending welfare as an entitlement program will give everyone hope, especially children like I once was.

I knew that I needed to go to college. When I was growing up, I worked hard at school. I studied for and took the S.A.T. tests. One thing that I did not plan for was the college application fee. I remember going to see my high school counselor during my senior year of high school. He had often helped me with questions I had about college. I told him, ''Well, it looks like I can't go to USD or any other 4 year college like I had planned. We'll have to talk about community colleges or something else.'' He said, ''What changed your mind?'' I told him that I had filled out my application and that at the bottom of the application, there was a statement advising applicants that the application fee was $25.00. There was no way I could come up with that. He didn't say much, but asked me to come back the next day to discuss it further. I did. When I showed up for the appointment, he handed me an envelope and told me to go home and send in my application. After leaving his office, I opened the envelope to see what was inside, and there was $25.00 cash. I didn't think too much about it at the time, although I was thankful. Now that I am older, that incident keeps coming back to me.

At the time, I guess I assumed that money came out of some school fund. Looking back on it, I think it probably came from his own pocket. On my current list of ''things to do'' is to hunt him down and pay him back. He would probably be happy to know that I did go to and graduate from college. This is a great example of people helping people. This is what welfare reform is all about.

As a society, it is our duty to teach people to take care of themselves. The government should not do for individuals what they are capable of doing for themselves. When the founders of our country first came to America, they came knowing they would work hard. We need to return to those values.

I have learned this. If you remain fixed in purpose, and strive to achieve your goals, you will succeed in this country. We live in a great country. If I had been born in India and into the caste system, I would still be poor today. If I had been born in a Third-world country, such as Panama or Mexico, I would still be poor today. This country was founded on the principles of hard work. Hard work made this country great. This is the land of opportunity.

Thank you to the elected officials who voted for welfare reform. Thank you to the elected officials who want to return this country back to the idea of smaller government and more personal responsibility.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LOCAL 210 AND JOHN CUNNINGHAM

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1997

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1997, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of American Local 210 will be celebrating its Diamond Anniversary and also recognizing John Cunningham who has recently retired as president of the New England District Council of Carpenters and president/general agent of Local 210. I am very pleased to rise today to congratulate Local 210 for reaching this extraordinary milestone and to offer my warmest congratulations to John on the occasion of his retirement after 41 years of leadership.

John is a wonderful friend of mine and I am delighted to have an opportunity to speak about his extraordinary record of accomplishments. John has overseen a number of new programs and policies during his tenure with Local 210. All these programs demonstrate his unwavering commitment to the welfare of workers. Beginning in 1968, Local 210 kicked off the very first apprentice program in all of New England. Today, that program is based in Norwalk with 125 active trainees. John's focus has always been on helping others, not only workers but also their families.

To this end, John oversaw the creation of a credit union to give members access to low-cost loans and a scholarship fund to make college money available to children of union members. However, the best example of John's exceptional commitment to members is his actions after the 1987 collapse of the L'Ambiance construction site in Bridgeport. Local 210 became the focal point of the National Building Trades Council effort to help the family members of those workers killed in the collapse. Under John's leadership, Local 210 raised more than $300,000 for the families. I am sure that many people are very