other family members, loved ones, friends, and admirers who recognize that Judge Angelo Darrigo will be sorely missed.

FAST TRACK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, by defeating fast-track negotiating authority, the House holds a rare and, in fact, profound opportunity—after nearly two decades of growing pleas from the American people—to define a new and responsible American free trade policy where trade becomes a two-way corridor—where reciprocity reigns; where America's trade ledgers move from deficit to surplus again; where fair treatment and a living wage is afforded people who work, and where the wages and benefits earned by America's workers rise again; where the rule of law gains ascendancy on a global basis; where respect for the world's environment is fundamental; where we as Members of Congress uphold our own sovereign constitutional responsibilities as this Nation's chief lawmaking body on trade.

Congress must respond to the plight of people like Ethel Tyner or David Filipiak or Griselda Rodriquez—our fellow citizens who have paid the price of flawed trade agreements. Our trade policy cannot abandon people such as Wanda Napier of Missouri, who had worked for Lee Apparel for 14 years and whose job was terminated and moved south of the border.

Like millions of other Americans who remain invisible to the persistent proponents of fast track, Wanda was on the losing end of fast track. Vanity Fair Corp., parent company of Lee Apparel which has been expanding its operations in Mexico and other foreign countries while terminating 1,650 more jobs in the United States, suddenly announced in September 1996 it was closing the plant where Wanda had worked for over a dozen years, throwing 350 Americans out of work.

President Clinton, after failing to acknowledge her plight for nearly 2 years recommended the fast-tracker's panacea to Wanda—retraining. Well, she went for retraining. In her own words,

> We were ridiculed and humiliated by the local division of Employment Security. Even though most of us had never asked the United States government for a dime in their lives, we were treated like we were worthless and had our hands in the government till. We were told we couldn't go the schools we wanted or take the training we needed. We were told that the only training we could have was the quickest, the fastest, and the cheapest.

Today Wanda works for two-thirds her former wage and receives no health benefits or pension.

A vote against fast track is a vote of conscience that puts a human face on trade. It is a vote that says where trade is not a two-way street, serious human casualties prevail. The President claims that fast-track trade agreements create ''good, high-paying jobs at home.'' What jobs? The Economic Policy Institute has identified almost 400,000 more lost U.S. jobs, 19,000 in Ohio, just from NAFTA. In just the last 3 months, nearly 3,000 more jobs have been moved to Mexico alone. Yes, Mr. President, more people are working but they are working harder for less—4 percent less since NAFTA and GATT even in this time of economic growth, and 20 percent less over the last 20 years.

Just ask thousands of Americans whose jobs are being fast-tracked outside the United States as we conduct this polite debate—the 279 recently terminated workers at Eveready Battery in Fremont, OH; or the 350 terminated workers at Jansport in Burlington, WA; or the 1,500 workers that got pink slips at Fruit of the Loom in Louisiana this Tuesday; or the 10,000 at Kodak in Rochester, NY and elsewhere who await their layoffs this week; or the thousands of vegetable farmers and production workers in Florida whose futures have been permanently altered because our Government failed to respond in a timely manner to the import surges that wiped out over 225 farm operations since NAFTA's passage. Talk to the hundreds of thousands of terminated workers whose jobs have been fast-tracked, and who if they have been re-employed, now earn $2 less per hour on average than on their previous job, many of them working part-time, or for reduced hours with lower or nonexistent health and pension benefits.

On the global front, it's time for a realignment of U.S. trade policy that goes beyond the narrow tariff and investment focus of NAFTA and GATT. America must not trade away its middle-class jobs. Expanding trade must be linked to democracy building and social development abroad—free trade among free peoples.

As John Kennedy taught us, ''economic growth without political freedom elsewhere remains an empty promise'' in history's long struggle toward the liberation of subjugated people. Tonight, we demand an international trade policy that respects people as much as it respects capital.

Will the trade rules that govern that global market ensure that trade does not become a race to the bottom, undermining America's jobs, wages, and consumer and environmental protections? Will it lead to the development of democracy and the rule of law in other nations or simply enforce plutocracy? The question for the 21st century is whether the world trade regime will foster a global village or a global plantation. So far, U.S. trade negotiators have been successful in safeguarding capital rights—foreign investment, copyrights, and corporate prerogatives but unsuccessful in safeguarding people's rights—a living wage and decent working conditions, a safe environment, and a lift in the standard-of-living for our people as well as those from other lands. If America keeps its markets open while other global markets remain highly hurdled, we will continue to erode our middle-class standard-of-living and degrade the world's environment. America has a moral duty to assure that the global marketplace benefits everyone, not just those capital interests with the deepest pockets.

U.S. TRADE DEFICITS HAVE EXPLODED

Let us look for a moment at the ledger. For a century, America has been the world's leading trading nation. We still are. Whether the United States will lead the world in the next century is not the question. The question is where will we lead. Until the mid 1970's, U.S. trade accounts had been generally in balance. But over the last 20 years, particularly since, fast track has become a device to end run Congress, America has amassed enormous trade deficits that today lop one full point off of U.S. GDP, representing $1 trillion in lost income.

The pattern is familiar. Dole Pineapple, for example, closes down all its production in Hawaii, abandoning thousands of employees, moves its operations to low-wage havens such as Vietnam and Thailand where field workers are paid with three meals a day. Dole's female processing workers earn pennies an hour, and the pineapple they can is then shipped here to the United States for sale. All the while the price-per-can increases. Dole stock rises on Wall Street, but the workers on Hawaii's main street get pink slips, while the productive capacity of Hawaii is diminished. The story is the same whether it is a Japanese corporation such as Bandai, or Nike, or dozens of others who trade off people's sweat for money.

What we see is a handful of giant global firms, many with assets larger than nation states, who hold no national allegiance and gravitate to the lowest common denominator in wage scales. They are the ones who have the front row seats at the World Trade Organization in Geneva. They continue to monopolize the benefits of the current trade regime.

I can understand why these groups support fast track and other means to limit congressional debate and perusal of these vital agreements. What other measures that come before Congress are subject to after-midnight votes, Congress being held hostage, and such arm-twisting. Let me remind you these global firms have not created a single net new job here at home in the past quarter century. So isn't it time for us to take account of their ledger, and demystify it for the American people.

What has happened in the past 25 years is that the United States has become the residual importer for world markets that largely remain closed to us. The important figure is the net of exports minus imports. On this the United States has been the clear loser for over two decades.

The United States racked up a $170-billion trade deficit for 1996. Add this to the deficits of the previous 20 years and the trade debt represents $1.8 trillion of wealth transferred from the American people to foreign creditors—a massive loan from foreign countries which must eventually be repaid. Our trade deficit with China will surpass $40 billion this year; post-NAFTA, our surplus with Mexico has fallen to an $18-billion deficit; our annual $50-billion deficit with Japan remains intractable. In fact, for every country with which the United States has negotiated a fast-track agreement, our Nation has fallen into deficit. Since the United States hold a positive trade balance with Chile and the MERCOSUR nations, why rock the boat? Shouldn't Congress exercise its responsibility to correct that which is wrong with the current system before expanding it?

If the trade deficit keeps growing at this rate for another decade, the United States will essentially be paying the equivalent of 2.5 percent of our GDP in trade debt service—virtually all of the recent annual increase in the GDP! This means our people pedal harder but their bicycles still slip backward. Moreover, this continued hemorrhaging of U.S. jobs and industry hollows out our manufacturing and

agricultural base. There is a difference between Wall Street's paper money and productive wealth.

If the United States does not take the initiative to modernize our trade policies at this historical moment at the dawn of the 21st century, I ask, what country will? Who will carry the burden to root our trade agreements in our fundamental national values, beginning with individual dignity and justice for all.

The ongoing fast-track debate has served to illuminate the deficiencies of oldstyle trade agreements. It cannot pass on its merits. The frantic wheeling and dealing by the White House and the Republican leadership that characterized the last 100 hours of the debate shows the opponents of fast track have already won a great moral and intellectual victory. So in a historic and troubling last-minute search for votes, every conceivable lure has been used to dangle in front of undecided members—Christmas tree provisions in appropriation bills, threats to take away Members' chairmanships, tax breaks for southern towns, bridges, roads through national forests, financial help in upcoming primary and general elections, trade preferences for sub-Saharan African nations, tobacco subsidy guarantees, wheat ad wine deals—you name it; it's on the table.

It my 15 years in Congress, this type of tawdry, unyielding pressure convinces me just how powerful the forces resisting change are. It also tells me how strong are the oaks in this Chamber who have stood against the wind. We have scored a real victory for the American people and light a roman candle for the dignity of working people everywhere.

DOES THE PRESIDENT NEED FAST TRACK?

This and preceding administrations have negotiated over 220 trade agreements without fast-track authority. The Uruguay round of the GATT proceeded for several years without fast track. The Clinton administration is currently negotiating a multilateral agreement on investment without fast-track authority. The United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement was negotiated without fast track. The President has constitutional authority to negotiate with other sovereign nations. The only reason the President needs fast track is so he doesn't have to seriously consult or negotiate with Congress.

Think about it. Without fast track, U.S. trade negotiators will be in a stronger position vis-á-vis our trading partners if they have to sell the deal to Congress. The suggestion that our trading partners won't deal with us without fast track is ludicrous. If President Clinton can say, ''I want to do this, but Congress is insisting on inclusion of these provisions . . .'' doesn't that strengthen his hand?

Congress certainly is capable of dealing with extremely complex legislation. Each year, we pass 13 highly complex appropriation measures, thousands of pages in length. Each year, we adopt a defense authorization bill thousands of pages in length. And hasn't Congress dealt with budget and tax measures thousands of pages in length, controlling hundreds of billions of dollars in spending and taxes?

MAKING IT THERE AND SELLING IT HERE

The United States represents about 4 percent of the world's population and enjoys about 22 percent of the world's products. To maintain our standard-of-living, it is argued, we have to sell to the other 96 percent of the world's population. But of the world's 6 billion potential consumers, 80 percent are only window shoppers, low-wage workers or subsistence farmers. Under the fast track agreements, we don't sell a net positive balance of consumer goods to other countries; we send capital and capital goods out of our country where goods are assembled by low-wage workers often employed for ''hunger wages,'' and then re-exported back to the United States and sold here at high prices—U-turn goods. Mexico is the prime example. NAFTA assured that Mexico would become one of the primary low-wage export platforms to the United States market, presently surpassed only by China. Nearly 3,000 plants have located just south of the border and they are called ''in-bond'' plants. I agree; labor is held in bondage. Since NAFTA, the Mexican domestic market has shrunk but its export market, primarily to the United States, has expanded dramatically. This process keeps putting severe downward pressure on United States living standards. If Europe and Japan maintain positive trade balances with Mexico, why is it only the United States that keeps digging a hole of debt with Mexico deeper and deeper? And with China? And with Canada?

HEALTH, SAFETY AND DRUGS

What does a fast-tracked trade policy mean for the quality of American life? Danger. Since 1990, food-borne outbreaks in the United States from imported food have included: shigellosis from imported green onions; salmonella from imported cantaloupe and imported alfalfa seeds; cyclospora from imported raspberries; and cholera from imported coconut milk. In Michigan earlier this year, more than 200 cases of hepatitis A were associated with frozen strawberries imported from Mexico and illegally labeled as United States grown. Strawberries imported from Mexico were found to have an 18.4 percent violation rate for illegal levels of pesticides in 1993. A 47-count indictment was brought against a California firm for fraudulently labeling Mexican grown strawberries as United States grown. On May 29 the Centers for Disease Control reported that imported raspberries were the cause of a 1996 outbreak of hepatitis.

Yet inspection of produce for pesticides on imported food has been reduced. The absolute number of imported food sample inspections decreased from 6,463 in 1993, to 5,448 in 1994, and to 5,032 in 1995—a decrease of 28 percent over that period. Inspection of imported Mexican produce declined from 1,820 samples in 1993 to 1723 samples in 1995 even though imports doubled. The food provisions of NAFTA constrain food safety and agricultural disease and pest inspections. NAFTA specifically forbids imported food from being inspected at the border more thoroughly than the same domestic commodity.

Moreover, under NAFTA we have not just opened our southern border to unsafe food. We have thrown the door open for the importation of the illegal drugs that degrade and destroy our communities. Key provisions for cross-border trucking have been relaxed resulting in Mexico becoming the primary route for the importation of drugs into the United States. The vast majority of trucks entering the United States from Mexico enter without inspection.

During the closing moments of the NAFTA debate in 1993 when it was clear that our position was on the short end of the votes, we promised the American people during that singularly compelling moment here in the House that our fight would continue in the tomorrows to come—a fight against the narrow visions of the elites and Wall Street who would abandon those who work in our factories, on our farms, and on Main Street. We have continued valiantly in our efforts, and we can be proud as we vote here today. For it is in our hearts, that reside the truest principles of democracy, prosperity, and respect for ordinary people of extraordinary spirit. Our victory gives hope to those in our world who struggle for democracy, for labor rights, for human health and safety in the workplace, and for the right to speak out as we have spoken out today.

When the vote on GATT occurred, we said when that vote was over, it would not be over. Its consequences would be felt for years to come. As a result of the elections of 1994 and 1996, we have been joined by many new Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who fought to be our new partners and in that fight to forge a new American responsible trade policy. These colleagues did not share our experience as we battled NAFTA in 1993 and GATT in 1994. But they have heard the will of the American people as they campaigned for the seats they now hold, and they have made the difference.

Out of these many battles in a long struggle has come a deep awareness on the part of the American people that trade and jobs are inextricably linked and that people matter more than profits. On the floor of this House, we not hear the voices of those who bear the pain of NAFTA, the indignities of GATT. We must now proceed to constructively fashion a trade policy that moves America and the world into an era of trade-linked advancement for people or ordinary means.

I said in 1993 and again in 1994 during the GATT debate—also scheduled after midnight during a lame duck session of Congress—that working people would remember those votes. I say again America's working families will remember this vote as well. Let history show it was here, together, in the people's House where the journey began to enshrine in trade laws the highest ideals of a free people. Let us inspire a world where the majority long for a better way of life along the path that leads, not back to the 19th century, but forward to the 21st.

HONORING JOSEPH SULTAN

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 12, 1997

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the work and achievements of Joseph Sultan.

Joe Sultan is a Brooklyn native who graduated from Abraham Lincoln High School in 1972. He attended the Cooper Union for the Advancement of Art & Science where he received his bachelor of architecture degree in 1976.

After graduation, he worked for such prestigious architectural firms as Davis Brody Associates, Giorgio Cavaglieri and Warren Gran & Associates.

In 1983, Joe established his own firm. Sultan Associates and in 1991 merged with Warren Gran & Associates to form Gran Sultan