

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

EXTEND THE BENEFITS OF FREE TRADE

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for those who missed it, I would like to bring an opinion piece from the February 26th Wall Street Journal to the attention of my colleagues. The subject of the piece is international trade in the Americas.

Foreign trade is of increasing importance to Americans and the companies they work for in today's global economy. After reviewing the relevant data, it is only possible to conclude that North American Free Trade Agreement, for example, has been of great benefit to Ohio's economy. Specifically, Ohio exports to Canada and Mexico grew 34.7 percent between 1993 and 1996, and Canada and Mexico have become Ohio's leading and sixth most important export markets, respectively. Exports to our NAFTA trading partners accounted for nearly half of Ohio's total exports in 1996.

Fifty percent of the impressive national economic growth of the last five years can be attributed to our exports, and the success of NAFTA has been crucial to this growth. Ohio jobs supported by exports—which pay 13 to 16 percent higher than the national average for non-export related jobs—have grown 19 percent since 1992. Finally, U.S. exports to Canada and Mexico have resulted in an increase of 311,000 jobs for Americans.

It is an economic fact that free trade benefits those on both sides of trading relationships. Again Mr. Speaker, I commend the following column by Sidney Weintraub of CSIS and Jeff Chisholm of the Bank of Montreal to the attention of all interested parties.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 26, 1998]

EXTEND THE BENEFITS OF FREE TRADE

(By Sidney Weintraub and Jeff Chisholm)

The most significant obstacle to the U.S. further extending its trading relationships has been the domestic political challenge posed by vocal critics who assert that freer trade destroys jobs. Opponents used that argument in November when they blocked congressional reauthorization of President Clinton's fast-track authority.

But the facts belie the anti-free-trade rhetoric. In the years since the North American Free Trade Agreement was ratified, unemployment has declined in each of its member countries—the U.S., Canada and Mexico.

In the U.S., whose economic expansion is beginning its eighth year, unemployment has reached its lowest level in a quarter century. Canada, emerging from a long recession, is anticipated to have the highest growth rate of all G-7 countries in 1998; its unemployment rate dropped dramatically in December, to the lowest level in seven years. Mexico, which only two years ago experienced its worst single-year economic decline since the Great Depression, rebounded in 1996 and 1997 to its best performance since the 1970s. Its economic growth was 7% last year;

inflation is declining; its stock index is more than 20% higher than it was a year ago. Unemployment in the main cities is now below 3.5%.

A recently completed survey of 361 medium-size and large businesses in the U.S., Canada and Mexico not only confirms these macroeconomic trends, but specifically indicates that Nafta has had no adverse impact on jobs. This survey—to be released next week by Bank of Montreal; its U.S. subsidiary, Harris Bank; and its Mexican affiliate, Grupo Financiero Bancomer—found that since Nafta came into effect in 1994, 47% of all North American businesses have gained employees while another 41% employ about the same number. Only 11% of the firms surveyed said that they had lost employees since 1994; of the 361 firms surveyed, only one, a U.S. company, directly attributed its job losses in Nafta. These findings indicate that increased international opportunities, coupled with the significant domestic growth all three economies have experienced in recent years, has fueled job creation across North America.

Seizing on Nafta's success, Mexico has been concluding free-trade agreement with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere. Canada has concluded a free-trade agreement with Chile and has plans to expand its free-trade network further. Of the three Nafta countries, then, the U.S. stands alone in its inability to expand its access to Latin American and Caribbean markets through trade negotiations. The consequence is that North American producers will increasingly base their operations in Canada, Mexico and elsewhere to avoid the discrimination they would face by exporting directly from the U.S. American workers will suffer as a result.

The continuing crisis in Asia makes trade within the Western Hemisphere more important than ever. Already, Canada and Mexico are the top two destinations for U.S. exports, and Latin America has become the fastest-growing regional market for U.S. goods. Similarly, the U.S. is clearly the most important destination for Canadian and Mexican goods.

The leaders of the hemisphere will meet in Santiago, Chile, for the Summit of the Americas in April, at which they will make final preparations to negotiate a Free Trade Area of the Americas. They will look for leadership from North America, especially the U.S. If Mr. Clinton arrives in Santiago without fast-track authority in hand, the U.S. will be isolated from the current hemispheric trend of market opening and sub-regional economic integration.

The proposed FTAA is the logical next step for expanding trade and investment opportunities throughout the hemisphere. It would be unfortunate if the U.S. squandered the opportunity.

IN HONOR OF ARCHIMANDRITE FATHER PAVLOS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Archimandrite Fa-

ther Pavlos on the occasion of his ordination and enthronement as Metropolitan Pavlos.

On Sunday, March 1, at the ordination ceremony, the Holy Synod of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of Greece announced the creation of a new Metropolis of America, which will absorb the former Diocese of Astoria. The newly enthroned Metropolitan Pavlos will rule the Metropolis.

Metropolitan Pavlos is a life-long resident of Astoria, which I represent. He was born Petros Strategeas in 1955 to Panagiotis and the late Maria Strategeas. He completed his elementary and secondary education in the United States and Greece and graduated from the American Community School in 1977. He graduated from the College of Theology of the National and Kapodistric University of Athens with a degree in theology in 1978.

In 1979, he was ordained Deacon by the late Metropolitan Petros of Astoria and renamed Pavlos. Six years later, in 1985, Pavlos was ordained Presbyter by the same Metropolitan and received the title of Archimandrite.

Over the years, Archimandrite Father Pavlos provided himself to be dedicated to the Astoria community. At his church, Saint Markella Cathedral, Father Pavlos' dedication to Astoria's children is strongly evident. He began a day care program for young children at the church which he hopes to increase; his after-school homework assistance program has helped many students.

His magnanimous nature extends far beyond Astoria's young people. Father Pavlos provides comfort for the sick, refuge for those in need and assistance to people who are new to and unfamiliar with Astoria and the United States. Since 1987, he has maintained direct contact with the Greek community through a television program on National Greek Television.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues rise with me in this tribute to the newly enthroned Metropolitan Pavlos of the Genuine Orthodox Christians of America. His tireless efforts for Astoria residents and the Greek community is outstanding. I am proud to have Metropolitan Pavlos as a constituent.

WILMA DEAN OF BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY, IN

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share an inspiring story with my colleagues and the American people about a woman whose whole life has been full of kindness, compassion and hard work. Wilma Dean, of Bartholomew County Indiana, is a Senior Guest Representative at the Ramada Inn in Columbus. In her twenty-five years of service as a Ramada Inn employee Wilma created a warm atmosphere, for the guests, which was like a home environment. Wilma accomplished

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

this through her courtesy and her ability to be a team-player. Recently, Wilma was rewarded for her exceptional job performance. Wilma's efforts were identified by the Inn's sixty-thousand employees. She was one of five employees to receive a nation-wide award: Hospitality Employee of the Year. Wilma Dean's hard work, dedication and kindness is an important example for others to follow. Work hard. Be kind to others. And help your neighbor if you can.

JOE CAPLING: DEDICATED LEADER, DEVOTED FATHER, TRUE FRIEND

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Harbor Beach have lost a dedicated community leader, a successful businessman and a loyal friend with the passing of Joe Capling. He was truly a unique person and will be missed by his family and friends.

A Harbor Beach City Council Member for 11 years, Joe was a dedicated public servant and highly respected community leader. He served as part of the City's administration, police, Department of Public Works and negotiation committees and the Development Finance Authority Board, rarely missing a city council meeting. People admired Joe and respected his opinions because they were always well thought-out and honest decisions.

He was concerned about the city's growth and success and supported every effort to improve the prosperity of the area. The town and the people were his top priorities. He never wavered on them, even in the face of external pressures and criticism. It is rare to find an individual who was so committed to the well-being of the employees of Harbor Beach and the well-being of the community.

Joe was very proud of and dedicated to the successes of his children and grandchildren. He instilled values that will serve them well throughout their lives. Because he was so committed to his family, he owned and operated the family hotel, Smalley's with his wife, Beatrice, who passed away in 1989. It became a friendly hometown bar where the townspeople loved to congregate. Listening to Joe's entertaining stories created a warm and inviting atmosphere.

As a life member of American Legion Post No. 197 and its past Commander, Joe held various offices at the district and regional levels. Joe also found happiness and solitude in the outdoors, where he loved to fish and hunt.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is so much turmoil in the world, it is comforting to know that there are still generous people, like Joe Capling, who care about their community and serve it with such integrity. Please join me in remembering and honoring Joe's legacy.

DEFINING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention my monthly newsletter on foreign affairs from February 1998 entitled *Defining the National Interest*.

The newsletter follows:

DEFINING THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The basic test for judging any foreign policy decision is easy to state but hard to apply: Does it serve the American national interest?

During the Cold War, the guiding principle of U.S. foreign policy was clear: the containment of communism. There was broad agreement that the Soviet Union represented a dire threat to American security and values. Every foreign policy decision was viewed through this prism, and defining the national interest was not difficult.

Today, defining the national interest is much harder. The Administration has described expanding and strengthening the world's community of market-based democracies as the goal of American foreign policy. But this concept is abstract. It gives only broad guidance to policy makers who have to make the tough decisions.

Every government in the world wants to involve the United States in solving its problems. Yet even the world's only superpower cannot solve every problem or address every tragedy—the American people will never support such a role. The President and his advisers must decide which issues matter for the United States, and which do not. A decision to invest time and resources—or to risk the lives of young Americans—must be based on a hard analysis of the U.S. national interest.

The national interest has several components:

First, to preserve the territorial integrity of the United States and the safety and security of its people. Peace requires a strong U.S. deterrent and a balance of power.

Second, to sustain U.S. economic prosperity. To continue to improve the standard of living and the quality of life for all Americans, the U.S. must open markets and advance the principles of the free market. We also need to be able to react to financial crises, whether they are in Latin America or Asia, in order to minimize their domestic impact.

Third, to promote democratic values. U.S. support for freedom, individual rights, the rule of law and democratic institutions around the world helps secure peace and stability among states, and advance human rights within states.

Fourth, to promote basic human rights—such as freedom from starvation and genocide, religious freedom, and freedom of political expression. The importance of human rights should not be underestimated. Rights abuses not only violate core U.S. values and ideals—they undermine stability in nations and regions where other U.S. interests are at stake.

Finally, to protect the health and welfare of the American people. The free flow of people and products around the globe means that Americans are no longer isolated from dangers elsewhere, including international crime, drugs, terrorism, and communicable diseases.

No other country in the world has such broadly defined national interests as the

United States. Our interests are at stake in every corner of the world and every sector of human life. On every continent the U.S. has multiple political, economic, strategic and humanitarian interests. When confronted with the many threats to the national interest—as the United States is confronted each day—we must prioritize those interests or be overwhelmed by them.

Priorities. Not all interests fall into the same categories. Some U.S. interests are vital. Vital means that you are prepared to go to war, if necessary, to defend them. Vital interests include protecting the people and territory of the United States from nuclear, biological, chemical (NBC) or conventional military attack. They include preventing any hostile power from dominating Europe, the Middle East, Asia or the high seas—as we did in World War II and the Cold War. Some interests are vital, even if force cannot protect them, such as preventing a catastrophic collapse of the world economy and financial system.

The United States also has several very important interests: to prevent the proliferation of NBC weapons and missiles anywhere; to maintain strong ties with our neighbors in the hemisphere and our allies in Europe and Asia; to help resolve regional conflicts; to advance stability in Africa; to promote democracy and the rule of law; to foster U.S. prosperity through free markets and an open trading system; and to promote respect for human rights.

The United States has other important interests, which we cannot disregard without jeopardizing our long-term security. These include several transnational issues: fighting international drugs, crime and terrorism; reducing disease and global poverty; protecting the environment; and addressing population growth.

Resources. Setting priorities among these competing interests guides resource allocation. We need to determine what resources—both human and material—we are prepared to risk or expend to protect the American national interest. Meeting all of the challenges to U.S. foreign policy requires difficult decisions in allocating scarce resources. We simply cannot do it all.

Judgment. When considering the question of the national interest, there is no substitute for sound judgment and political leadership. Americans often have competing views about which interests should dominate, and what level of resources to commit. Presidential leadership in sorting out these questions is critical.

The President conducts American foreign policy. He has the principal burden of persuading the Congress and the American people about the threat to the national interest, and convincing the public that his chosen course of action will protect those interests at an acceptable cost.

Conclusion. Focusing on the question of the U.S. national interest will not—and cannot—resolve all differences over foreign policy. Reasonable people will disagree about priorities and resources. But asking the right questions will help us arrive at better answers.

TRIBUTE TO ISABELLE GLEN-LAMBERT

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 2, 1998

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating Isabelle