Former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps; Jack Kemp, Co-director, Empower America, Former Member of Congress; Zalmay M. Khalizhad, Director, Strategy and Doctrine Program, RAND Corporation; Lane Kirkland, President Emeritus, AFL–CIO; Jeane Kirkpatrick, Former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Henry Kissinger, Former Secretary of State.

William Kristol, Editor, The Weekly Standard; Melvin Laird, Former Secretary of Defense; Anthony Lake, Professor, Georgetown University, Former National Security Advisor; F. Stephen Larabee, Senior Staff Member, RAND Corporation; Arnold G. Langbo, Chairman of the Board/CEO, Kellogg Company; Ronald S. Lauder, Chairman, Central European Media Enterprises Ltd.; Michael Ledeen, Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute; I. Lewis Libby, Partner, Dechert, Price & Rhoads, Former Principal Undersecretary of Defense; Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government, Georgetown University; Seymour Martin Lipset, Hazel Professor of Public Policy, George Mason University; Bette Bao Lord, Chairwoman, Freedom House; Winston Lord, Former Assistant Secretary of State; Will Marshall, President, Progressive Policy Institute; Paul McCracken, Professor Emeritus, University of Michigan Business School, Former Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors.

Dave McCurdy, Chairman, McCurdy Group, Former Member of Congress; Robert C. McFarlane, Former National Security Advisor; John Melcher, Former U.S. Senator; Walter Mondale, Former Vice President of the United States; John E. Moon, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Joshua Muravchik, Convenor, New Atlantic Initiative Working Group on NATO Enlargement, Resident Scholar, American Enterprise Institute; Michael Nacht, Former Assistant Director, U.S. ACDA; Matthew Nimetz, Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, Former Undersecretary of State; James J. Norton, President, Graphic Communications International Union; Michael Novak, George Frederick Jewett Scholar in Religion, American Enterprise Institute, Former U.S. Ambassador to the UNHRC; William E. Odom, Ltg. USA (ret.); Director, National Security Studies, Hudson Institute, Former Director, National Security Agency; Daniel Oliver, Former Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; John O'Sullivan, Founder and Co-chairman, New Atlantic Initiative, Editor, National Review.

William A. Owens, President, COO, Vice Chairman of the Board, Science Applications International Corporation; Charles Percy, Chairman, Charles Percy & Associates, Former U.S. Senator; Richard Perle, Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense; William Perry, Former Secretary of Defense; Daniel Pipes, Editor, Middle East Quarterly; Norman Podhoretz, Editor-at-large, Commentary Magazine, Senior Fellow, Hudson Institute; Colin Powell, Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Former National Security Advisor; Dan Quayle, Former Vice President of the United States; David Rockefeller, Retired banker; Peter Rodman, Director of National Security Programs, Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom, Former Director, Policy Planning Staff, U.S. Department of State; William Rogers, Former Secretary of State; Henry S. Rowen, Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense; Edward L. Rowny, Ltg. USA (ret.), Former Chief U.S. Negotiator to START talks; Donald Rumsfeld, Former Secretary of Defense.

Jeffrey D. Sachs, Director, Harvard Institute for International Development; Jeffrey T. Salmon; George Shultz, Former Secretary of State; Dmitri K. Simes, President, Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom; Paul Simon, Former U.S. Senator; Alan Simpson, Former U.S. Senator; Joseph J. Sisco, Former Undersecretary of State; Leon Sloss, President, Leon Sloss Associates; Stephen Solarz, President, Solarz Associates, Former Member of Congress; Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Guest Scholar, The Brookings Institution, Former Counsellor, U.S. Department of State; Fritz Stern, University Professor Emeritus, Columbia University; Robert S. Strauss, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, Former U.S. Ambassador to Russia; William O. Studeman, Adm. USN (ret.), Former Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; Stephen Szabo, Academic Dean, Johns Hopkins SAIS; Gregory F. Treverton, Director, International Security and Defense Policy, RAND Corporation, Former Vice Chairman, National Intelligence Council.

Cyrus R. Vance, Former Secretary of State; Stephen W. Walker, Director, Balkan Institute; Ben J. Wattenberg, Senior Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; Vin Weber, Partner, Clark & Weinstock, Former Member of Congress; William H. Webster, Former Director of Central Intelligence; George Weigel, Senior Fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center; W. Bruce Weinrod, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense; Ross Williams, President, Secretary/Treasurer, Oklahoma State AFL-CIO; Paul Wolfowitz, Dean, Johns Hopkins SAIS, Former Undersecretary of Defense; Ronald B. Woodard, President, Boeing Commercial Airplane Group; R. James Woolsey, Former Director of Central Intelligence; Dov S. Zakheim, CEO, SPC International Corporation; Robert B. Zoellick, Vice President, Fannie Mae, Former Undersecretary of State; E.R. Zumwalt, Jr., Adm. U.S.N. (Ret.), Former Chief of Naval Operations.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2621

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am generally supportive of the concept of giving the Executive broad authority in negotiating treaties and other international agreements. Unfortunately, from my perspective, the granting of this authority by Congress to the Executive has not served the Nation well recently, and I am now reluctant to grant that same authority again.

Those who feel otherwise will say that Congress still retains its complete authority to approve trade agreements because Congress has the final say in passage. Unfortunately, this argument has not proved to be true in recent years.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, is the prime example of this. I am absolutely certain that if Congress had the option to amend the NAFTA agreement when it was presented to it, the agreement would not have been adopted in its current form. Many of the proponents of the legislation we are considering today say that NAFTA has been an unqualified success. To them I say success is not determined by the profit margins of a few successful companies and an increase in the number of low-wage jobs in the United States. I suggest that our trade agreements should do more than line the pockets of the rich, for that does not serve our country well. If we are going to enter into new trade agreements, they should help our Nation as a whole—if not, it is not in our national interest to do so.

Conceptually, Mr. Speaker, I support free trade. No one argues economies are improved or consumers benefit from supporting less efficient producers of any given product. If all countries were equal, free trade would and should be the norm. But, unfortunately, not all nations have equal economies. In general, the more-developed counties are able to pay higher wages, provide more benefits to their workers, prohibit child labor, and place greater restraints on business activities which pollute the environment at a higher rate.

As a result of our economic development and the changes in business activity which we in the United States and the other developed countries value, in purely economic terms, the less-developed countries are able to produce many goods at a lower cost than we can produce them in the United States.

With NAFTA in place, businesses have taken advantage of the disparity between the United States and Mexico, and have moved their manufacturing operations from the United States to Mexico. To keep the costs down of products going to be sold in the United States, these businesses construct new plants along, but on the Mexican side of, our southern border. The net result of this has been the loss of good, well-paying jobs held by Americans.

In return, consumers in the United States can purchase products at a lower price. Economists say this is good: everyone in the United States, except those few who lost their jobs—and their families and the other businesses which supported the now-closed industry—are better off, they say. In a limited economic sense, those people who purchase that product at a lower cost are better off. Except, even those still employed are now paying higher taxes to cover the increased cost of unemployment insurance, food stamps, and other programs available to assist those in need.

In addition to those costs, we have increased pollution in our atmosphere, more chemicals dumped into our earth, and more people working in sub-standard conditions for below poverty-level wages. In the case of Mexico, we also have increased motor traffic from vehicles which do not meet our safety or air pollution standards, and more recently, an increased amount of illegal drugs entering our country with the increased commerce.

The end result of this shift in location is instead of obtaining a product made by someone in the United States making a fair wage

and with reasonable medical benefits, that U.S. employee has lost his or her job and we are offered a product made by a foreigner who is paid a sub-standard wage and who is provided no medical benefits. As an extra benefit, we residents of earth are subjected to increased pollutants added to the planet.

Before NAFTA was adopted, we were told that a secondary benefit of the agreement would be an easing of the immigration problem along our southern border. Have you noticed how no one makes that argument anymore? That's because there has not been an easing of the immigration problem. The theory was that the people entering the United States through Mexico came to the United States solely to seek employment, and that if they could get that employment in Mexico, they would not need to cross our border. Well, what happened? The theory did not prove true. Why not? I submit that the unemployment problem in Mexico is of such a magnitude that the number of jobs added as a result of NAFTA didn't put a dent in the number of people who want to come to the United States. The result has been we lost all those jobs and we still have an immigration problem.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make these statements to be critical of Mexico. Over the decades, in many ways Mexico has been a better neighbor to the United States than the United States has been to Mexico. The root of our immigration problem stems from the different speeds at which our economies have developed. The time will come in the not to distant future, when the Mexican national economy will be as strong and vibrant as ours, and we will be in balance. At that point, free trade will be mutually beneficial for both nations, as it currently is for the United States and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a few moments to talk about my congressional district, American Samoa, and what is happening to us, and the other U.S. territories, in the name of free trade.

I represent the people of the U.S. Territory of American Samoa. We are removed from all major surface and air transportation routes and our annual per capita income is $3,000.

In American Samoa, the largest industry is the processing of canned tuna, most of which is sold in the United States. This has been a staple of the American Samoan economy for the past 30 years. In recent years, however, I have witnessed the repeal of the possessions tax credit—IRC Sec. 936—the implementation of NAFTA, the implementation of tariff reductions under GATT, and the weakening of the dolphin safe label. Each of these actions will make American Samoa less competitive than foreign nations, and there has been nothing on the other side of the ledger to assist American Samoa or the other U.S. territories.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about first- and second-class citizens residing in the 50 States. I am increasingly concerned that we will soon have third-class citizens residing in our territories. There are nearly 4 million of us, and it is past the time for this growing problem to be addressed. This is a major concern to me, and if the past is any indication of what we can expect from future trade agreements, H.R. 2621 will hurt, not help the United States as a whole, and American Samoa in particular.

Mr. Speaker, unlike you, I do not have the privilege of voting on this legislation, even though if it is enacted into law it will more than likely have a direct impact on my congressional district. I wish I had this privilege, for I would certainly vote no, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT OF 1997

SPEECH OF

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sunday, November 9, 1997

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for House passage of S. 714, as amended. This bill, much of which was approved by the House earlier in the session, contains several provisions of great importance to America's veterans. Foremost among these is a 4-year extension of the Native American Veteran Housing Loan Pilot Program, created in 1992, which authorizes the Veterans' Administration to make direct home loans to native American veterans living on Indian trust lands. This program eliminated many of the barriers so often encountered by native Americans seeking financing for homeownership, and a 4-year extension will allow the program's success to continue, to the benefit of increasing numbers of native American veterans.

As a veteran, I certainly recognize the indispensable contributions that America's veterans have made in selfless dedication to their country. The Native American Veteran Housing Loan Pilot Program is one significant way in which Congress can express its gratitude for the exceptional service demonstrated by native American veterans, and indeed by all of our Nation's military personnel. With the approach of Veterans' Day, when we remember the millions who have served this country as members of the Armed Forces, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and I applaud the Veterans Affairs Committee for its recognition of the continuing importance of this program.

VISA WAIVER PILOT PROGRAM

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2267, the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill.

One of the provisions included in the bill is a 6-month extension of the State Department's Visa Waiver Pilot Program [VWPP]. This is the mechanism by which our country allows visitors from approximately 26 nations to enter the United States without visas. Passports are sufficient for entry.

And this is a good program. Obtaining visas is a time-consuming endeavor, from applications, screening, approval, and to issuance. We do not need to require visas of every visitor from abroad, and the Visa Waiver Pilot Program has been a tremendous success for years in expediting foreign visitors, whether for employment, tourism, family, or business purposes.

I have been working closely with Congressmen BARNEY FRANK, JAY KIM, and others with the leadership of the Immigration and Claims Subcommittee, particularly Chairman LAMAR SMITH and ranking Democrat MEL WATT, to resolve a problem—specifically whether Portugal and the Republic of Korea should be included in the visa waiver program. They have exerted tremendous time and energy and effort to identify and resolve problems in the program and we are committed to working together in the months ahead to adjust the program so that citizens of these countries can travel to the United States with only a passport.

Mr. Speaker, during the hearings and committee consideration of the visa waiver program, concerns were raised by some Members and the State and Justice Departments. I do not believe those concerns are insurmountable, and we are working with those agencies to address security and other concerns. We all feel that the current waiver criteria should be reformed, and I will be working in the months ahead with my colleagues to craft a visa waiver system that expands visitor opportunities.

As you know, tourism is the dominant industry in Hawaii, and it is crucially important that we have a visa waiver system for tourists that allows a maximum number of visitors to enter the United States. Thousands of Hawaiian families and individuals are dependent on tourism and on the number of visitors using hotels, restaurants, transportation facilities, and retail businesses. A strong case has been made that citizens of Korea, one of our strongest allies in the world, should be given the waiver consideration that we have afforded 26 other nations.

The 6 months extension of the existing Visa Waiver Pilot Program is a prudent decision, and reflects a good-faith effort being made to address constructively the issues facing the future of the program. I look forward to working with Chairman SMITH, the members of the House Judiciary Committee, and those seeking an expansion of the program to develop an effective and workable program addressing all concerns.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO THE REPUBLICAN FAST TRACK PROPOSAL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 13, 1997

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a protrade, proenvironment, and prolabor Democrat. I do not appreciate being placed in a position where I must oppose a free trade bill, in this case H.R. 2621, the Republican fast track trade proposal. I must oppose this particular proposal because it does not include the elementary steps that might have made it acceptable. We could achieve the very same results that H.R. 2621 seeks with a more balanced bill that does not sacrifice the interests of workers here and abroad and environmental quality as well.

I believe strongly in free trade. For those who do not, I would simply say that we have no choice today except to compete in world markets if we are to continue to create high-paying, private sector jobs and to sustain economic growth. However, there are good and ample precedents on how to move to broader,