FOIA Number: 2017-0401-F

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Policy Development

Series/Staff Member: Jason Berman

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 10603

FolderID:

Folder Title:
[Fast Track - Miscellaneous] [2]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	100	2	3	1

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	The Business Roundtable White House Briefing; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (2 pages)	09/09/1997	b(6)
002. list	Attendees to the Fast Track Briefing; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (3 pages)	09/04/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Policy Development
Jason Berman
OA/Box Number: 10603

FOLDER TITLE:
[Fast Track - Miscellaneous] [2]

2017-0401-F
db4721

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Bill Noble / Lee Casanova / Tara Fischer

Extension of Fast Track Trade Negotiating Authority

What Is Fast Track?

The short answer is that it is an expedited procedure for Congressional consideration of trade agreements. The ~~two~~ 3 essential features of any fast track authority are: (1) specified notice and consultation provisions ensuring Congress' involvement in trade negotiations; ~~(1)~~ (2) a vote on implementing legislation within a fixed period of time, and ~~(2)~~ (3) an up or down vote, with no amendments.

Trade Negotiating Authority

The Constitution gives Congress exclusive authority to set tariffs and enact other legislation governing international trade. The President has the Constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements. If the President negotiates a trade agreement that requ ... er domestic laws, that trade agreement's ... submitted to Congress--or the Presider ... approval of such changes. Tariff cuttin ... Congress has often granted the Presid ... y has been included in all of the recent g ... changes implementing other provision ... provides for a time certain vote and th ... no amendments.

Jay — USTR's changes

Historical Background to Fast Track

For over 60 years, the Congress ... open ... that the negotiation and implementation of trade agreements require special cooperation. In the aftermath of the record-high rates of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Depression they helped ~~create~~, both the Congress and the President recognized that only by working closely together could trade barriers be torn down and markets opened to U.S. goods ~~and services~~. This new attitude was first reflected in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, giving the President authority to both negotiate tariff cutting agreements and to implement them without further Congressional approval.

In recent years, as tariffs became less of an obstacle to trade and many

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

Jay —
USTR's chays

✓

Bi Historical the Economic Tariff Fast

Extension of Fast Track Trade Negotiating Authority

What Is Fast Track?

The short answer is that it is an expedited procedure for Congressional consideration of trade agreements. The ~~two~~ 3 essential features of any fast track authority are: (1) specified notice and consultation provisions ensuring Congress' involvement in trade negotiations; ~~(1)~~ 2 a vote on implementing legislation within a fixed period of time, and ~~(2)~~ 3 an up or down vote, with no amendments.

Trade Negotiating Authority

The Constitution gives Congress exclusive authority to set tariffs and enact other legislation governing international trade. The President has the Constitutional authority to negotiate international agreements. If the President negotiates a trade agreement that requires changes in U.S. tariffs or in other domestic laws, that trade agreement's implementing legislation must be submitted to Congress--or the President must have Congress' advance approval of such changes. Tariff cutting authority is one instance where Congress has often granted the President prior approval and such authority has been included in all of the recent grants of fast track authority. For changes implementing other provisions of a trade agreement, fast track provides for a time certain vote and that vote is on the total package, with no amendments.

Historical Background to Fast Track

For over 60 years, the Congress and the President ~~have~~ recognized that the negotiation and implementation of trade agreements ~~require~~ special cooperation. In the aftermath of the record-high tariff rates of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 and the Depression they helped ~~create~~ to deepen, both the Congress and the President recognized that only by working closely together could trade barriers be torn down and markets opened to U.S. goods ~~and services~~. This new attitude was first reflected in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, giving the President authority to both negotiate tariff cutting agreements and to implement them without further Congressional approval.

In recent years, as tariffs became less of an obstacle to trade and many

Submitted by Nixon but ~~enacted under~~ Ford

or extended

then on-going

of our trading partners sought to protect their domestic markets by erecting non-tariff barriers, the scope of trade negotiations broadened and by agreement between the ~~Nixon~~ Administration and the Congress, fast track was created to accomodate this broader trade agenda. Specifically, it was first embodied in the Trade Act of 1974 to deal with the Tokyo Round negotiations under ~~called for in~~ the GATT. Fast track procedures for approving trade agreements have been renewed by Congress in 1979, 1984, 1988, 1991, and most recently in 1993. As a result, Presidents have had fast track negotiating authority continuously from January 1975 until April 1994, with a brief hiatus for eight months in 1988.

Need to put in past tense. We are collapsing FT + won't have separate procedure for mult. + bilateral deals

Fast Track Is Essential to Successful Trade Negotiations

In exchange for the expedited consideration of implementing legislation, Congress has established a number of procedural safeguards that guarantee it a meaningful role both before and during the negotiating process and, equally important, in determining how to implement trade agreements. Requests for fast track have always included extensive notification and consultation requirements, both for Congress itself and for private sector advisory committees. In every trade agreement negotiated under fast track, Congress has been an active participant in identifying negotiating objectives, monitoring and consulting w/ the Admin on the actual negotiations, and drafting implementing legislation.

In order for a trade agreement to receive fast track status ~~To apply fast track to a trade agreement, whether sectoral, bilateral or multilateral~~, the President must notify Congress in advance of his intention to sign such an agreement. For most previous grants, the advance notice requirement was 90 days~~; for the Uruguay Round, because it was such a massive agreement, the notice requirement was set at 120 days~~. ~~Even before~~ Once the President signals his intention to enter into an agreement, the private sector advisory committees are required to report to both Congress and the President on their views as to whether the agreement meets U.S. negotiating objectives. Further, for bilateral trade agreements, the Congress must be given advance notice of the President's intent to begin negotiations. During the next 60 legislative days, either the House Ways and Means Committe or the Senate Finance Committee can vote to deny fast track for the proposed bilateral.

Once the negotiations have been concluded and the President has signed ~~it~~ an agreement, the Congress and the Administration begin a period of extensive informal discussions on the drafting of the implementing legislation. This process, reflecting the growing complexity of trade agreements, has involved an ever increasing number of committees of jurisdiction and interested Members. In addition, the President is required to spell out precisely how he intends to use his existing regulatory authority in implementing the agreement. And, of course, Congress retains the right to vote down an agreement if, after all of the consultations, it still finds the package unacceptable.

provided for,

Additional Congressional prerogatives include a special procedure for revoking fast track if the President fails to meet the consultation requirements. Finally, in recent instances where fast track authority has been granted and extensions ~~included~~, either House has retained the right to disapprove of such extensions provided that either the House Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee ~~have~~ has reported out an "extension disapproval resolution."

requiring Congressional approval

Why Fast Track Is Essential To Trade Negotiations major

Fast track procedures reflect an Executive-Congressional understanding that trade agreements to open markets and tear down tariff barriers are the product of difficult negotiations and that permitting an entire agreement to be subject to individual amendments means unravelling the agreement. In order to determine whether any trade agreement is in the national interest, it requires looking at the total package in its entirety. Without fast track, it is virtually impossible to see how any negotiation could produce a final offer from our trading partners if each provision in the package was subject to amendment.

By granting Presidents fast track, Congress has empowered American Presidents with the same bargaining power and negotiating authority possessed by our trading partners. That is, the ability to ensure that the agreement so painstakingly negotiated would be the agreement voted on. Without fast track, the President cannot make such an assurance and without it, few would be willing to enter into a negotiation and even fewer would be willing to negotiate the tough concessions necessary. No trading nation would ever reveal its final, best offer knowing that ~~the United States~~ could unilaterally reopen the agreement.

~~major~~ trade Congress

The United States Trade Agenda: What Is Fast Track For

Not our agenda

After consultations with Congress, the President will set out the nation's trade agenda for the next few years. The absence of large-scale negotiations like the Tokyo and Uruguay Rounds has mistakenly led some to conclude that not having fast track is not a problem for the United States. That is ~~just as wrong a view as the idea that this request for fast track is only about~~ extending ~~NAFTA to Chile~~. incorrect.

example, for

The President has identified three main areas in which negotiations would greatly benefit the United States. First, there is the "built-in" agenda of the WTO, which calls for negotiations on ~~government procurement in 1997;~~ intellectual property in 1998; agriculture in 1999; and trade in services in 2000. In each of these areas, the United States is the most competitive nation in the world and, as a result, we stand to benefit the most from actively participating in ~~writing the rules of trade~~ bringing down trade barriers.

The second part of the President's proposed agenda involves building on the success of the Information Technology Agreement(ITA). This $5 billion tariff cut on products for which the United States is the world's leading producer was achieved by the use of residual tariff cutting authority from ~~a previous grant of fast track~~ the Uruguay Round act. We have identified eight additional sectors for future negotiations: ITA 2, chemicals, automotive, oilseeds, energy equipment and services, environmental technology and services, medical equipment and services, and wood and paper products. Other APEC members have submitted their "wish lists" and it appears there is sufficient overlapping support for some ~~many~~ of the U.S. suggestions. Without fast track, it is very unlikely that this process will go forward.

explain

The third area the President hopes to address is ~~moving forward~~ progress in both the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum(APEC) toward the goal of free trade by the year 2010 and with a Free Trade Agreement for the Americas(FTAA)by the year 2005. In both regions, economic growth rates are among the highest in the world and barriers to U.S. exports remain high. As a result, tariff reductions and greater market access will have a very positive effect on our exports. Without the active participation of the United States, both of these processes will slow considerably--and without fast track we

cannot participate actively.

The President and many Members of Congress have indicated that negotiating a trade agreement with Chile is a critical step in continuing the move to trade liberalization in the Hemisphere. The Canadians have already concluded a bilateral treaty with Chile and the result, for our exports, is that we face an across-the-board 11% tariff disadvantage.

It is important to remember that non-participation by the United States in global trade negotiations does not mean that our competitors are going to call a halt to their efforts to gain market access and preferential tariff treatment. On the contrary, they are very active in advancing their own agendas. Since 1992, in Latin America and Asia they have concluded over 20 free trade agreements--agreements that leave us at a disadvantage.

The United States is the most competitive nation in the world. That is why it is so advantageous for us to play a leading role in establishing both the ~~focus~~ of trade ~~negotiations~~ and the rules. We will not have the opportunity to do either in the absence of fast track. trade agenda

Why trade is vital for US economic future.

from opening markets

Berman

'97 SEP 4 AM8:18

HIGHLY SENSITIVE DRAFT
9/4/97 am
EYES ONLY

TALKING POINTS: CABINET MEMBER HILL CONSULTATIONS

- We plan to launch our fast track initiative on September 10. We wanted to share with you our current thinking and identify issues of particular significance.

- Securing passage of fast track authority is among the President's highest priorities this Fall because he strongly believes we must tear down foreign barriers to American goods and services if we are to keep our economy growing and to create new, good, high paying jobs.

- As the President has said repeatedly, and most recently in his radio address two weeks ago, he has three primary objectives in this arena: (1) to negotiate tough, reciprocal agreements that expand exports, (2) to promote worker rights and (3) to promote responsible environmental development.

- On the economic front, we intend that the fast track authority will allow the President to negotiate tough, reciprocal trade agreements. We believe all sides are in accord with this objective.

  - o Opportunities exist now to reduce barriers in key sectors in which the U.S. is the most competitive

    - Some of the opportunities arise in connection with scheduled negotiations in the WTO, for example, in the areas of agriculture and services, markets worth more than one-half trillion dollars and 1 trillion dollars, respectively.

    - Others arise from new sectoral initiatives, like the recently concluded Information Technology Agreement, which amounted to a $5 billion tariff reduction on American products sold to other nations. We will launch ITA-II and other sectoral initiatives later this Fall.

  - o We also need fast track to negotiate more open markets with specific countries, especially in Latin America and Asia, two of the fastest growing regions in the world (growing 3 times as fast as our economy). With 95 percent of the world's consumers living outside or borders, we must open the markets of these growing economies.

- o The legislation will provide notification that we would recommence negotiations to reach a comprehensive trade agreement with Chile. We have not yet identified other countries with whom we would commence FTA negotiations. Congressional consultations would be necessary before approaching other specific countries.

- We are beginning consultations with the Republicans to test their flexibility on the main issues in the bill, the primary one being how labor and environmental issues will be handled. The President views these as priority issues.

  - o Our goals are (1) to ensure that the President can pursue his priorities, (2) to develop legislation that will pass, and (3) to get maximum Democratic support.

- We have to ensure that whether under fast track authority or under the President's executive authority, the President can pursue his priorities effectively. One possible formulation that we are considering is a concept we advanced in 1995, namely that fast track procedures would apply to labor and environmental issues directly related to trade. This formulation would allow the President to use fast track authority in the same manner as past Democratic and Republican Presidents, and to address the full range of labor and environmental issues using his executive authority.

- In developing this legislation, we have considered the views of those that insist that all labor and environmental policies and practices be the subject of trade agreements. While we can discuss the merits of that view, the practical reality is that we cannot get fast track authority from this Congress to do that.

- The consequence of not having fast track authority is that we will sideline ourselves economically and strategically, with great cost to American companies, workers, and the country; we will also not be in a position to pursue the very objectives that are important to the labor and environmental communities.

  - o Only if we are engaged can we pursue these goals.

  - o The choice is about obtaining the authority that is sufficiently flexible to allow the President to pursue all three objectives or obtaining no authority, in which case progress will be more difficult to achieve on any front.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
"DIRECTLY RELATED TO TRADE"
(For Cabinet meetings with Democratic Members)

Q: What will the Administration's fast track legislation propose regarding labor and the environment?

A: As the President has said repeatedly, and most recently in his radio address two weeks ago, he has three primary objectives that fast track authority must allow him to pursue: 1) to negotiate new trade agreements to break down foreign barriers, expand exports, and continue an unprecedented economic expansion; 2) to promote worker rights and; 3) to promote responsible environmental development. Our proposal will permit the President to continue to pursue all three objectives.

One possible formulation we are considering is a concept we advanced in 1995, namely that fast track procedures would apply to labor and environmental issues directly related to trade. This formulation would allow the President to use fast track authority in the same manner as past Democratic and Republican Presidents, and to address the full range of labor and environmental issues using his executive authority. This approach emerges out of significant consultations between the Administration and members of both House and both parties; the labor and environmental communities, and the business community, including agriculture. We believe it fulfills the President's key objectives, which are to ensure he has the necessary flexibility to address trade, labor and environmental issues in an effective manner.

Q: What does "directly related to trade" mean? What provisions could be included in a trade agreement under that definition?

A: We are still discussing the precise formulation of the term and its meaning. It would cover types of labor/environmental provisions that have been included in past trade agreements. Regardless how it is defined, we want to emphasize that trade agreements are only one way to promote labor and environmental progress in other countries. The Administration will use a variety of tools to advance its labor/environment agenda. In addition to trade agreements, these will include:

> Side Agreements: When appropriate, the Administration would negotiate labor/environment side agreements under which countries would make commitments relating to labor/environment standards and enforcement. For example, Chile has already committed to negotiate such agreements in the context of free trade negotiations with the U.S.
>
> Other Initiatives: The Administration has been aggressively promoting core labor standards and environmental protection abroad through initiatives not necessarily related to trade negotiations. Examples include:

- The Administration's Sweatshop Eradication initiative brings together labor unions, businesses and others to end exploitable labor practices and improve working conditions, both here and abroad. Companies have already pledged to accept external monitoring of their labor practices.

- The Administration has led the world in promoting adherence to core labor standards in the ILO, the WTO and other fora.

- The Administration established the Committee on Trade and Environment in the WTO, for the first time ensuring a permanent forum for addressing these issues.

- In the President's first term, Secretary of State Warren Christopher directed the entire State Department to incorporate environmental concerns into its diplomacy. He took the unprecedented step of establishing State Department environmental offices in targeted regions having special environmental problems.

We are confident that the combination of these tools will permit us to effectively advance our labor/environment agenda

Q: Can you give me an example of a labor/environmental provision that is "directly related to trade"?

A: This formulation would allow us to incorporate in future trade agreements the principle that countries should not lower their environmental standards to attract foreign investment.

Q: Cong. Gephardt would insist that the Administration include all labor or environmental provisions in future free trade agreements? Would you have preferred to include a broader range of these provisions in trade agreements?

A: We would have preferred to have more flexibility regarding the breadth of the term "directly related to trade", but that is not achievable. Nevertheless, our proposed approach will permit us to achieve all of the President's three objectives.

Q: Will the Administration insist that any labor/environmental side agreements be enforceable through trade sanctions?

A: We are in the process of reaching bipartisan agreement with Congressional leaders over the approach that should be taken in the labor/environmental area. That approach will consist of a package of steps we would take to promote labor rights and the environment. Whether sanctions are envisioned will depend on the content of the entire package. In any case, we will insist that the President be able to pursue his three objectives effectively.

WASHINGTON WHISPERS

Will TV stand its ground?

Plans to redesign the White House lawn are stuck in limbo

Jay—
FYI
Jeany

Should White House employees parking in the streets around the president's home have to go underground to make way for more grass, flowers, and shrubs? If so, would an underground garage be extended in the direction of the Washington Monument and would it be opened to the public? Will network correspondents giving on-camera reports keep their well-worn spots on the White House lawn, or should the sites be turned into a garden? These are among the questions unresolved among the 12 government agencies—including the National Park Service and the White House Military Office—that must sign off on a comprehensive redesign of the 82 acres, known as the President's Park, that surround the White House. The study was ordered two years ago by **President Clinton** in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, when Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House was closed to traffic. Originally scheduled for release last September, the plan now is supposed to be made public this fall. In truth, the plan is in limbo. Some of the agencies do not want the tentative plan released for public comment because so many questions remain unresolved. In any case, no funds have been appropriated to implement it. Officials who have read the draft plan predict sharp public debate among those arguing for green space, those insisting on security first, and those who want to preserve maximum public and media access to White House grounds. Washington, D.C., officials will almost certainly fight one recommendation to ban vehicular traffic behind the White House.

Paper chase

At least two Commerce Department employees have been working full time—on the government payroll—setting up a **Ronald H. Brown** Memorial Library to hold the papers of the late Commerce secretary. Although apparently no Commerce secretary has ever had such a library and, so far, no institution has agreed to house the collection, many of Brown's most important papers already have been moved from Commerce. Washington lawyer **Larry Klayman** now says the removal of documents has hampered the discovery process involving his suit against Commerce over trips by corporate executives who accompanied Brown on foreign trade missions. Klayman, a conservative judicial activist, filed a Freedom of Information Act request nearly three years ago asking Commerce to explain how executives were picked for the trips. The suit provided the first peek into Democratic fund-raising activities and administration favoritism in these missions. It also led to the deposing of **John Huang**, a controversial Democratic fund-raiser and former Commerce employee. Last month, Commerce conceded that it withheld key information about Huang's activities and has offered to pay Klayman legal fees of $2 million.


RICHARD THOMPSON FOR USN&WR

Fast start on fast track

The White House will begin its big push this week for passage of "fast track" legislation to expand free-trade agreements into South America and elsewhere—one of Clinton's top priorities for his second term. First, senior officials, including U.S. Trade Representative **Charlene Barshefsky** and Commerce Secretary **William Daley**, will try to shore up support on Capitol Hill, especially among reluctant Democrats. Then Clinton, along with Vice President **Al Gore**, will begin a series of high-visibility events to drum up support for the bill.

Power grab at State?

The Department of State is the nation's lead agency in the fight against terrorism overseas, but not everyone at Foggy Bottom seems to get the message. In what insiders describe as "a power grab," a move is underway to downgrade State's Office of Counterterrorism and absorb it into its larger Political-Military or International Narcotics bureaus. Given the administration's high priority in fighting terrorism, the counterterrorism office now enjoys direct access to the top levels at State. But the new structure would push it down the bureaucratic ladder. The proposed shift stems from a White House agreement with Sen. **Jesse Helms**, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, over reorganizing the U.S. foreign-policy apparatus. The GOP lawmaker held the chemical-weapons treaty hostage this year until officials agreed to fold the independent U.S. Information Agency and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency into State. Turf builders at State now see a chance to grab the small, but widely respected, counterterrorism office, whose coordina-

JOC 9/4 1A3

US lawmakers' plates are full as they race to end session

• *Highway bill, "fast-track" trade authority and ocean shipping reform are among the thorny issues that top Congress' agenda as it looks to end session early.*

BY WILLIAM ROBERTS
& JOHN MAGGS
JOURNAL OF COMMERCE STAFF

WASHINGTON — Working against an Oct. 15 deadline to finish its business for the year, congressional leaders are racing to complete work on a critical set of trade and transportation bills, including a massive highway spending proposal, new trade negotiating authority for President Clinton and a measure to overhaul regulation of the ocean shipping business.

Congress returned to the nation's capital this week bent on wrapping up the year's business early. That won't be easy.

Among the host of thorny political and legislative issues Congress will confront over the next six to eight weeks is a highway and infrastructure spending plan. Rep. Bud Shuster, R-Pa., chairman of the House Transportation Committee, is introducing his long-awaited reauthorization of the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act today.

The bill will authorize $104 billion in highway and transit spending over the next three years, far more than was alloted in the historic budget-balancing deal reached earlier this summer by the president and Congress.

One House aide predicts a battle between Rep. Shuster and other House GOP leaders over the funding levels in the bill. Further, Istea, as the bill is known, is a centerpiece of federal transportation policy and sets rules on freight access and mobility among trucks, rail and ports.

Many lawmakers have no stomach for long, drawn-out fights.

"Clearly, most of the members would just like to come back and wrap up the bare minimum of what they see as their fiduciary duties and get out," said Norm Ornstein, a political analyst at the American Enterprise Institute.

The balanced budget agreement was a respectable enough accomplishment for this session of Congress, he said.

See CONGRESS, Page 6A

JOC 9/4 1-3

Continued from Page 1A

Congress

"The biggest issue looming is 'fast-track' trade authority," Mr. Ornstein said, which pits labor against business and splits both parties.

"Obviously labor has come out swinging and that's going to make it tougher than usual," said one Senate trade staffer.

Fast-track authority is intended to speed legislation implementing trade agreements through Congress by barring amendments and requiring a prompt up or down vote. Without it, Mr. Clinton says other governments won't negotiate with the United States for fear that Congress will seek more concessions later.

The White House says it will use fast track to pursue free-trade negotiations with Chile and the rest of Latin America, and industry-specific deals with the Pacific Rim and with the more than 120 nations in the World Trade Organization.

Other issues on agenda

Beyond the fast-track fight, lawmakers will be occupied with a host of other issues.

Campaign finance reform hearings will stoke partisan wars and Sen. McCain, R-Ariz., is threatening to keep the Senate in session as long as it takes to get a vote on his and Wisconsin Democrat Sen. Russell D. Feingold's reform proposals. The transportation industry and its unions are major players in PAC and "soft money" contributions to both parties.

Congress also will try again this year to pass a bill that would reform regulation of the ocean shipping business.

The measure, now under review in the Senate, would allow shipping lines and customers to negotiate confidential transportation contracts and limit tariff and other filings with the federal government. The bill is intended to put ocean shipping on the same regulatory footing as other transportation industries.

The bill was approved by the Senate Commerce Committee earlier this year, but still faces opposition from labor unions and some ports. Supporters are hoping to resolve their disagreements with the unions and bring a consensus measure to the Senate floor soon.

Weld nomination, Amtrak reform

In other areas, Former Republican Massachusetts Gov. William R. Weld is pressing Senate members to confirm his nomination as ambassador to Mexico. Mr. Weld is opposed by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C.

Amtrak reform legislation will also be taken up in both the House and Senate, but not without a major fight from organized labor over proposed reductions in job protections for Amtrak workers. The battle may well spill into next year.

Separately, the House next week is expected to consider a proposal by Rep. Anne Northup, R-Ky., to curb expansion of a key international service offered by the U.S. Postal Service. Called Global Package Link, the service offers shippers electronic data links and customs processing to nine countries, including the lucrative Japan market.

The provision would prohibit expansion of the automated customs-clearing program into other markets for one year, while federal regulators audit the program.

Aviation funding, Teamsters election

On the aviation front, the National Civil Aviation Review Commission will hand up its preliminary report on funding issues to Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater and Federal Aviation Administrator Jane Garvey very soon, possibly next week.

The 21-member commission, comprising aviation experts and lobbyists appointed by the White House and Congress, is charged with examining funding mechanisms for the national airways and also with exploring safety issues.

Organized labor will come under close scrutiny in a House subcommittee headed by a conservative Rep. Peter Hoekstra, R-Mich. He plans to investigate why the federally funded Teamsters 1996 election between President Ron Carey and Jimmy Hoffa Jr. was declared invalid despite oversight by the Justice and Labor departments. The Teamsters election must be rerun because $221,000 in illegal contributions from union funds were allegedly donated to Mr. Carey's campaign.

Also pending is the administration's $630 million fiscal 1998 appropriations request for Ex-Im Bank. The bank is having trouble meeting export finance demand and a sympathetic Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to increase the amount to $700 million.

Prospects are also strong that the Overseas Private Investment Corp., which provides market risk insurance to U.S. companies investing in developing countries, will win a hard-fought renewal of its charter.

Michele Kayal, Tim Shorrock, Stephanie Nall and Richard Lawrence contributed to this report.

Jex

9/4

The agenda

Fast-track trade negotiations

A Clinton administration priority, reauthorization of fast-track trade negotiating authority is politically charged, pitting labor against business. Congressional approval would let President Clinton open formal talks on expansion of the North American Free Trade Agreement and other market-opening initiatives.

Status: Administration is expected to send proposed fast-track legislation to Capitol Hill next week. A quick House vote could come in October leaving the Senate a decisive role.

Ocean shipping reform

Partial deregulation of international containerized shipping trades. Bill would introduce new competition through "confidential contracts" but keeps much of existing regulation intact.

Status: Leadership compromise needed for Senate floor action. House on standby.

Highway program reauthorization

The Intermodal Surface Transportation and Efficiency Act of 1991 (Istea), a multibillion-dollar program at the core of U.S. transportation policy, expires and must be renewed. Congressional action is overdue.

Status: House committee advancing a limited, three-year bill that may be a budget buster. Senate committee offering a competing bill.

Amtrak restructuring

Financially troubled passenger rail line faces bankruptcy without a major bailout. Balanced-budget deal offers $2.3 billion but only if reforms favored by Republicans are enacted. Reforms opposed by trial lawyers and transportation labor.

Status: House committee is preparing a bill for floor action but faces a fight from labor. Senate may seek compromise with the White House.

Software exports

Law enforcement and national security agencies want to maintain export controls on sophisticated encryption software. Computer industry is pressing for liberalization.

Status: House bill has backing of software companies. Senate bill provides decoding access for law enforcement agencies.

Superfund reform

Congress continues to grapple with overhauling the nation's troubled Superfund toxic waste cleanup program under the Environmental Protection Agency.

Status: Senate Republicans have unveiled a new legislative draft that moves toward the pro-environment Clinton administration.

Banking law reform

A major overhaul of U.S. banking law pending in the House, would reform the Depression-era Glass-Steagall separation between banks and stock underwriters.

Status: A controversial subject the Senate is not expected to take up until next year.

Jones Act reform

Against the opposition of the U.S. maritime industry, a coalition of shippers is pushing for reforms in U.S. cabotage laws that protect domestic trades from foreign competition.

Status: Companion bills introduced in House and Senate, but no action expected until next year.

State Department

A two-year renewal of State Department programs, would be used by Senate to pay $819 million U.S. debt to United Nations over opposition of House Republicans.

Status: Competing versions were passed by the House and Senate before the recess. Now in conference talks.

Fast Track

NAFTA Has Caused Net Loss of U.S. Jobs, Study Says

By Jay Root, Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Texas
Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News

AUSTIN, Texas--Sep. 4--The North American Free Trade Agreement, linking the economies of the United States, Canada and Mexico, has led to a net job loss in the United States, according to a study by a coalition of Hispanic groups.

In its "Latino Review" of NAFTA, the coalition said a net 91,000 jobs have been lost since the accord took effect in 1994.

"It has been a big disappointment on all fronts," said Ricardo Castanon of the William C. Velasquez Institute, the San Antonio-based group that conducted the study with the National Council of La Raza and others.

The Institute, in a NAFTA Report Card, gave the accord an overall D-minus.

The study has been used as fodder in the fight over President Clinton's proposal to extend a NAFTA-like agreement farther south, most notably to Chile.

At least 16 U.S. congressmen, including five Texas Democrats, have cited the review in a letter to Clinton opposing so-called fast-track approval of that initiative.

The Clinton administration recently released a report on NAFTA. It found that the 3-year-old accord had created between 90,000 and 160,000 jobs, well short of the hundreds of thousands of jobs predicted.

The Hispanic coalition was particularly critical of the accord for failing to deliver on promises of job relocation assistance, environmental cleanup along the border and oversight of labor laws.

It noted, for example, that the North American Development Bank had completed financing arrangements for only one environmental project.

The study also found that Hispanics and blacks were the hardest hit in terms of jobs lost.

Among other suggestions, the institute recommended a moratorium on new maquiladoras -- plants on the U.S.-Mexico border -- and a longer transition period for displaced workers in certain industries.

The study found that workers in the auto parts, electronics and apparel industries had suffered the most under NAFTA.

Visit the Fort Worth Star-Telegram on the World Wide Web at http://www.startext.com, http://www.arlington.net and http://www.netarrant.net

-----

(c) 1997, Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Texas. Distributed by Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News.

KBviaNewsEDGE

Copyright (c) 1997 Knight-Ridder / Tribune Business News
Received by NewsEDGE/LAN: 9/4/97 3:37 AM

FAST

(B) Lott says Senate favors trade fast-track; he is undecided

By Steve Marcy, Bridge News
Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News

Washington--Sep 3--The US Senate is "generally favorable" toward renewing President Bill Clinton's "fast-track" trade-agreement authority, but any attempt to attach labor- or environmental-protection conditions to any bill "could kill it," Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said today. Lott's comments closely track those made Tuesday by No. 2 Senate Republican Don Nickles.

* * *

Lott today told reporters again he hasn't decided if he will support the fast-track measure Clinton is expected to unveil next week. He acknowledged he has previously voted for such measures, which would require Congress to either approve or disapprove a trade pact with another country, but prohibit Congress from amending it.

However, Lott noted that surrendering "our constitutional right to consider and amend a trade agreement ... is not something we give up lightly."

"I think we should look at every request and look at what's involved (in it) as it comes before us," he added.

The administration is hoping for a congressional vote on fast-track by mid-October. However, Lott gave no timetable. The pact it is seeking is an expansion of the North America Free Trade Agreement to include Chile.

Some Democrats, especially from the party's liberal wing in the House, have said they want environmental safeguards inserted and assurances that US workers aren't unduly displaced by foreign competition and that trade-pact countries have adequate worker-protection laws.

Those are the kinds of provisions that Lott and Nickles said would kill the measure. End

Bridge News, Tel: (202) 383-6194
Send comments to Internet address: news@bridge.com

This story is part of the Bridge News Markets Roundup, a convenient review of major financial market events and related major news updated every day. Bridge News also provides comprehensive real-time coverage of events affecting the world's markets 24 hours a day. For more information on Bridge News products and services e-mail news@bridge.com or call 1 (800) 927-2734.

Distributed by Knight-Ridder/Tribune Business News.

KFviaNewsEDGE

Copyright (c) 1997 Knight-Ridder / Tribune Business News
Received by NewsEDGE/LAN: 9/4/97 3:37 AM

FAST TRACK

Free Trade Process Seen Slowing Latin America Tariff Cuts

Dow Jones International News Service via Dow Jones

WASHINGTON (AP-Dow Jones)--Trade analysts said Wednesday the possibility of a Free Trade Area of the Americas has actually led to at least a short-term slowdown in tariff reduction as countries guard their bargaining positions and wait to see how negotiations will go.

Sebastian Edwards, an economist at the University of California, Los Angeles, broached the idea at a seminar on U.S. and Andean countries' trade.

The economic reform process in Latin America, and especially in the Andean countries, has undergone a 'tremendous slowdown' in the past two to three years, he said. That slowdown includes trade liberalization, as countries have waited to see what will happen with the FTAA, said Edwards, the former chief economist for the Latin American region at the World Bank.

Chile is supposed to be the first country to benefit from the U.S. expanding its free trade agreements, but Chile has been waiting for an invitation to join the North American Free Trade Agreement that hasn't come, Edwards said. The country 'should have lowered tariffs three years ago.' A pact has been held up because the U.S. administration hasn't gotten needed 'fast-track' trade negotiating authority.

While the FTAA may be one factor in the slowdown in unilateral tariff reduction, said Robert Devlin, chief of the trade issues division at the Inter-American Development Bank, he was confident liberalization would return.

Costa Rican Foreign Trade Minister Jose Manuel Salazar also said Edwards' observation was correct, but only as a short-term effect, reversing in the longer term.

Negotiations on the FTAA are scheduled to be formally launched by 34 country leaders in April in Santiago, with the goal of completing a pact for 2005.

(MORE) AP-DOW JONES NEWS 04-09-97

0110GMT

(AP-DJ-09-04-97 0110GMT)
:SUBJECT: DI7 DI1 DI6 SPRC MEX TRAD SOAM
Copyright (c) 1997 Dow Jones and Company, Inc.
Received by NewsEDGE/LAN: 9/3/97 9:07 PM

The Fort Worth Star-Telegram
Editorial
At Work
09/02/97

As much as we might like to see campaign finance reforms on the fall agenda for Congress, it is a subject that still will be drowned out by hearings and finger-pointing.

But Washington will find other things to do now that the budget outline and a tax bill have been agreed upon in a show of harmony and bipartisanship that is only skin deep. In many cases, Congress will deal this fall with contentious issues that we might have thought we settled.

Welfare, for instance. There are disagreements about how much people coming off welfare should be paid under work programs. There are rumblings about the need for better child support enforcement. Mainly, Republicans looking for an issue think there may be gold in their suspicions that President Clinton will want to weaken welfare reform.

* **But there are other arguments brewing. Fast-track procedures for trade agreements will be a hot one - both conservatives and liberals are suspicious of more NAFTA-like treaties. With the 1998 congressional elections approaching, affirmative action may be a hot topic.**

There will be squabbles about the appropriations bills that implement the budget agreement. There is the $468 billion tobacco agreement between states and tobacco companies, which will require federal approval. Education could become a front-burner issue, with a move to allow tax credits for private school costs. Religion will be brought into focus, with some conservatives wanting foreign trade and aid agreements to include prohibitions against persecution of Christians in other lands. Our presence in the Bosnian peacekeeping force will be debated anew.

For better or worse, this will be our government at work. Accept no substitutes.

Buffalo News
CONGRESS HAS LOTS TO LABOR OVER AFTER RETURNING FROM ITS HOLIDAY
08/29/97
EDITORIALS

LP Despite the jokes about Americans being safer when Congress is in recess, there's a lot the national legislature can do to improve the lives of citizens when it returns to work after Labor Day.

Some members may consider last month's historic balanced-budget deal to be a full year's work, considering how long it took to reach it. Others may try to turn the campaign fund-raising hearings into a year's labor.

TD But aside from passing the 13 appropriations bills needed to implement the budget accord -- which may be an arduous task in itself -- and holding more campaign scandal hearings, Congress also faces other big challenges this fall.

How well it meets those challenges will depend in large part on the skills of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and House Speaker Newt Gingrich. They must continue cooperating with President Clinton while taming the hardliners in their respective caucuses. Among other things, they must get Congress to:

Reform the campaign-finance system. The current system invites abuse, and simply exposing those abuses in endless hearings -- which will resume soon -- is not enough. The system must be changed if elections are to be rescued from the special interests and returned to the public.

Passing the McCain-Feingold reform legislation -- which includes voluntary spending limits, free and reduced-price TV time and postage, and limits on "soft money" -- would be a good start.

Strengthen and then pass the massive smoking settlement. The proposed $368 billion deal provides a good framework for putting the clamps on a tobacco industry that finally is on the run. But with government now having the upper hand, thanks to court rulings and shifts in public opinion, there is no reason to cede power to the industry or ease up financially.

The deal, as currently structured, would do both and must be revised.

Congress and the White House must come to an accord that protects the Food and Drug Administration's authority to regulate nicotine as a drug, recoups the $50 billion tax break sneaked into the budget bill for tobacco companies, and hikes the penalties on tobacco companies if they fail to meet targets for reducing smoking by youths -- whom they claim not to target, anyway.

Clear up the backlog on the federal judiciary. Roughly 12 percent of the seats on the federal bench are vacant, in large part because a Republican-led Congress is dragging its feet on confirming judges appointed by the Democratic president. Most of the nominees have yet to even get a hearing.

Republicans have made little secret of the reason for the delay: It's politics. After watching Ronald Reagan and George Bush stack the courts with conservative ideologues, Republicans are afraid Clinton might try to reverse the trend. But the current president consistently has tapped nominees from the judicial mainstream.

A Senate that claims to care about law and order should fulfill its constitutional mandate, act on those nominations and stop causing problems for the criminal justice system.

* **Take a hard and skeptical look at Clinton's request for "fast track" trade legislation. Such authority would let the president negotiate trade deals that would have to be quickly passed or rejected by Congress without any amendments.**

The administration wants this authority in order to expand the North American Free Trade Agreement southward, beyond Mexico, to some Latin American countries.

It's true that Washington has been slow to recognize the growth of trading blocs like the Brazilian-led Mercosur, which is looking increasingly toward Europe rather than the United States for business. But that is no reason to rush into more pacts that might only exacerbate the problems -- drugs, health and safety concerns, job dislocations -- that this nation already faces after linking arms with Mexico through NAFTA, which itself was a result of fast-track talks.

Christian-Science Monitor
NAFTA II: Bill vs. Dick
08/29/97
EDITORIALS

Drama in the making: A struggle touching some of the most important issues of our times, with a cast of top political stars, has been taking shape during the August doldrums. It's heading toward a mid- September run in Washington.

The drama: President Clinton's plan to expand the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to Chile - and other hemisphere nations.

TD The plot: Clinton twists arms among Democrats in Congress to win votes for so-called "fast track" legislation. He'll have support of many Republicans. But he needs more backing from his own party, whose labor union funders plan a major assault on NAFTA expansion.

The lead characters: Bill Clinton, seeking credit in history books as the leader who jump-started hemispheric trade. Al Gore, faithful sidekick and aspiring successor, who needs to woo activist labor leaders. Dick Gephardt, chief congressional foe of NAFTA and its expansion, and a big beneficiary of labor support. Also a frequent opponent of Clinton and a future rival to Gore for the presidency.

The big issues: Jobs and wages of US union members. Consumers' price tag for retail goods, food, cars, household equipment. Also environment protection, immigration, drugs.

The action: Democrat majority leader Gephardt flew south in mid-August to visit Chile, Argentina, and Brazil. Explored trade, wages, working conditions, factory pollution. Gathered ammunition for congressional debate on super-NAFTA. Made pilgrimage before Clinton, who will visit same nations later, with much greater fanfare.

The plot twists: Clinton will probably ask Congress in mid-September for fast-track trade authorization. He wants it for other trade negotiations as well. Fast track allows Congress only a yes-or-no vote; no pet amendments. Despite the president's lean toward labor in the UPS strike, he still needs to portray himself (and his supporters) as feeling labor's pain on wage competition south of the border. Ditto Gore. The VP also will seek to toughen environmental rules for Latin factories to reassure environmentalists worried by his recent wavering. Gephardt, eyeing the presidency, will want to appear less obstructionist than he did in his losing stand against NAFTA (and Clinton) in 1993.

A desirable ending: There should be no doubt that much of the growing-US and world prosperity in the past two decades - indeed in the past half century - is a result of global trade expansion. The US, with its huge internal market, was one of the last nations to "need" more trade to improve growth, jobs, profits, and standard of living. But the trade portion of Americans' prosperity continues to grow, particularly as US research and entrepreneurship create more of the idea-based technologies and services that are sweeping the world.

For this growing US export economy, NAFTA expansion makes sense. There has been no "giant sucking sound" of jobs going south to Mexico. In the still-fledgling years of NAFTA, jobs lost and jobs gained have netted out to a slight US gain. Job creation south of the border has been a factor in Mexico's gradual climb back from its economic plunge of two years ago.

No one can run economic experiments two ways to compare results. But it's logical to believe that job growth in Mexico helps curtail migration to the US. And the jobless in Mexico make ready foot soldiers for drug lords.

Are there lessons to be learned from NAFTA's brief existence? Should tougher regulations be required? Look at three areas: (1) work conditions, (2) wages, (3) environment impact.

1. It's in the interest of each nation to protect workers' well-being by legislating standards for safety, hours, ventilation, sanitation, work breaks, age, etc. A treaty cannot micromanage such standards. It can, and should, establish minimum goals.

2. NAFTA-type treaties shouldn't mandate pay scales. Wages relate to local cost of living and buying power. You can't equate Los Angeles and a Chiapas village. As in all good deals, both parties need to win. In trade, US consumers gain cheaper products. The US gains a reduction of illegal border crossing. US workers win some limit on wage competitors at home. Developing nations win a gradual rise in wages and standard of living. Citizens can afford more imports from the developed world - consumer goods, education, and, yes, entertainment. That's happened in much of Asia. It's happening in parts of Latin America.

3. Clinton has, in effect, already offered Gephardt a way to back off his argument about NAFTA factory pollution. The president recently indicated he would agree to a global warming treaty only if it demanded the same pollution restraints from developing nations' industries as from those in developed nations. That approach would avert a mass flight of industry (and jobs) heading south to escape pollution regulation. It should remove pollution arguments as a super-NAFTA stumbling block.

Synopsis: Learning from his 1993 cliffhanger role supporting NAFTA, President Clinton should press ahead decisively now.

Benefits outweigh drawbacks. History is on his side.

The Baltimore Sun
Campaigning for president already?; Early start: Gore and Gephardt spar while Republican roadshow for 2000 election begins.
08/28/97
EDITORIAL

LP STEVE FORBES has been broadcasting radio ads in key states since early this year. Lamar Alexander treated 1,300 activists to free lobsters at a New Hampshire picnic. Dan Quayle put on a full-court press at a political beauty pageant in his former home state, Indiana, last weekend.

What are all these Republican wannabes up to less than a year after Democrat Bill Clinton won another four-year stay in the White House? Can't Americans get a respite from these seemingly endless presidential campaigns?

TD Apparently not. Republican hopefuls paraded their bona fides before the party faithful in Indianapolis in the earliest kickoff yet to the presidential primary season. This one will be a true marathon, lasting a full three years.

Republicans have plenty of candidates to look over. Mr. Quayle, the former vice president, resurfaced as a conservative Republican purist and scold of Washington evils. Take that, Newt Gingrich, who was there defending the balanced-budget deal and other realities of life elected officials must face.

Outsiders, though, can play to Republicans' anti-Washington sentiment: Mr. Forbes and Jack Kemp are pushing for a flat tax (or better yet, no taxes at all); Pat Buchanan is preaching a conservative social agenda; Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the son of Mr. Quayle's boss in those White House years, is promoting his fresh (and largely unknown) persona, and the peripatetic Alan Keyes of Maryland is always happy to lecture on what's wrong with America.

Even beltway insiders are talking like outsiders. Sen. Fred Thompson talks of cleaning up campaign financing abuses. Rep. John Kasich calls for doing away with federal overspending and budget deficits. And Mr. Gingrich seeks redemption by renewing the battles Republicans lost to President Clinton.

This wide divergence in political views reflects the deep split within the GOP over its future course, with party pragmatists and ideologues pulling in opposing directions. Will Republicans campaign next time as a party of outsiders, or of congressional insiders? Will social Christian issues or traditional fiscal issues predominate?

Meanwhile, two Democrats have maneuvered all summer to woo their party's activists. House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt has distanced himself from the president, particularly over the

balanced budget deal. He eyes union and environmentalist support, groups Vice President Al Gore also has been courting. The two will * knock heads this fall over granting the president fast-track authority to expand the NAFTA trade accord.

With the stakes so high, it's no wonder so many politicians are willing to undertake this long, long race. Voters, though, wouldn't mind a three-year hiatus instead of a three-year presidential campaign.

Chicago Tribune
FOUNDED JUNE 10, 1847

SCOTT C. SMITH, Publisher HOWARD A. TYNER, Editor
N. DON WYCLIFF, Editorial Page Editor ANN MARIE LIPINSKI, Managing Editor
JAMES O'SHEA, Deputy Managing Editor/News GEROULD KERN, Deputy Managing Editor/Features
R. BRUCE DOLD, Deputy Editorial Page Editor F. RICHARD CICCONE, Associate Editor

Tuesday, August 26, 1997
Section 1

Grant fast-track authority fast

In his radio address last weekend President Clinton vowed a full-scale campaign to renew the fast-track trade negotiating authority Congress allowed to expire three years ago. Congress should move on the president's request at once.

Every administration since 1974 has enjoyed the essential tool of fast-track negotiating authority. It commits Congress to consider and vote, without amendment, on trade deals within 90 days of their submission by the president. Its benefit is obvious: No foreign government is inclined to enter into trade negotiations with the U.S. only to have Congress change the agreements later on.

Congress failed to renew fast-track authority in 1994, following the bitter political debate over the North American Free Trade Agreement. Now lingering bitterness from labor unions, environmentalists and their Democratic supporters in Congress has stalled the president's bid to regain the power.

As a result, Clinton has not been able to honor promises to bring Chile into NAFTA and work toward a hemispheric free-trade zone by 2005. Meanwhile, some European and Asian competitors have moved in to close their own treaties with some Latin American countries.

U.S. labor unions fear competition from cheaper foreign labor while environmentalists fear ecological degradation by Third World countries with lower pollution standards.

And as the presidential hopefuls begin to move into position, House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt of Missouri is reaching for the baton to lead the chorus of free-trade opponents and position himself against Vice President Al Gore in the Democratic primaries.

Yet the dire consequences predicted by NAFTA opponents—most notably Ross Perot's "sucking sound" of jobs being siphoned off by Mexico—have not materialized. An analysis released by the Clinton administration in July concluded that NAFTA had had a "modest positive effect" on the U.S. economy.

NAFTA, in fact, has been more successful than that. It has accelerated trade between its three partners—the U.S., Mexico and Canada—by 44 percent. There is no concrete evidence that the U.S. has suffered a net loss of jobs from NAFTA or that it would do so if Chile joined the pact. Indeed, in the wake of NAFTA's approval, the U.S. has enjoyed employment and economic growth envied by much of the world.

Free trade means jobs and opportunity. Why is Congress standing in the way?

The Press-Enterprise
08/27/97
The Press-Enterprise Riverside, CA

An opportunity for trade

Though the success of NAFTA is still open to debate, President Clinton nevertheless should be awarded by Congress the authority to negotiate free trade agreements beyond Mexico with other Latin American countries.

Free trade with Mexico has had some shortcomings, but this country's lowest unemployment rate in 24 years is evidence that NAFTA has not proved to be a mechanism to siphon U.S. jobs across the border, as many had feared.

NAFTA has not, however, been the economic generator it was expected to be south of the border, either, as evidenced by so many Mexicans still living in poverty.

Did the Clinton administration oversell NAFTA's job-creating potential? Yes. But the potential remains there and certainly some cards remain to be played - like an emergence of the North American Development Bank as an economic stimulator for infrastructure improvements on the border.

The administration will open its campaign for so-called "fast-track" status in regard to Latin America next month. Opponents will raise a number of issues including drug smuggling. There is a lot at stake here - fast-track status grants the president power to negotiate trade deals that Congress must consider quickly and cannot amend.

Make no mistake, the president has had his share of problems with Latin America (Helms-Burton sanctions, or lack thereof, in Cuba; sanctions regarding Colombia over its mixed anti-drug record).

But, in spite of any of these shortcomings, it would be shortsighted to ignore the potential of Latin American markets - particularly now since many of these individual governments have proven their stability after, in many cases, years of division. An expansion of trade in the Americas has a lot of promise.

FAST TRACK/President requires quick trade negotiation authority

08/26/97

Houston Chronicle

(Copyright 1997)

When Congress returns to work after Labor Day, it should move quickly to give President Clinton fast-track authority to negotiate trade agreements with other nations.

The president needs fast track approval by Congress in order to include Chile in the North American Free Trade Agreement, now limited to Mexico, Canada and the United States, and to act rapidly in nailing down new trade pacts in Latin America and Asia.

Without fast-tract authority, which every American president enjoyed from 1974 until its expiration in 1994, the United States may find itself excluded from the most lucrative trade relationships in Latin America and Asia as European nations lock up the best deals.

Clinton noted in his radio address Saturday that since 1992 competitors have won almost two dozen trade agreements in Latin America and Asia that exclude the United States.

Congress naturally does not readily give up any of its power, including the power to amend trade agreements.

Yet unless Congress grants fast track to the president, allowing him to negotiate trade pacts for yes-or-no approval by Congress, foreign markets may be lost to U.S. exporters.

Consumer markets in Latin America and Asia are growing three times faster than in America, and the United States must make sure it has a fair share of those markets.

If this nation's economy is to grow, it must continue to expand its overseas trade.

Overseas trade accounted for one-quarter of the nation's economic growth over the past four years. That's new jobs and higher pay checks and expanded production for American workers.

Congress should speedily grant President Clinton fast-track authority in order to open new trade doors and to keep old markets from being closed by foreign competitors.

Bangor Daily News Bangor, ME
Corporations sans borders
08/27/97
(Copyright 1997)

With the success of the North American Free Trade Act far from certain, especially for states such as Maine, President Clinton is trying to force through an expanded version of the trade pact on the same fast track that NAFTA used. Congress should turn this express train into a local, placing the democratic process before the rush for promised wealth.

Five or six years ago, NAFTA was a fairly mysterious item. One set of economists predicted it would greatly invigorate the nation's economy; another set promised financial ruin. Though the United States, Canada and Mexico are still early in the free-trade process, it seems clear that NAFTA is not going to provide any economic miracles or drag the nation into an economic abyss. Rather, it might provide some more wealth overall without especially helping manufacturing or textile states. It has also emphasized -- for good and ill -- the disparity in workplace safety and environmental laws between this country and elsewhere, where labor costs are considerably lower.

The most important lesson since NAFTA, however, is that the fine print matters. Guidelines for job security, worker retraining, working conditions, border inspections and environmental controls, among a thousand other details, are what make the difference between a useful trade pact and a corporate whitewash.

The president's demand for fast-track approval, in which Congress could either agree to or reject the trade treaty but not alter it, asks members of Congress to ignore the fine print. Congress, which should be held accountable for U.S. involvement in such deals, need not roll over so easily. No matter the care that experts from various countries used in assembling the complex trade agreements, its provisions need public exposure. The people who have the greatest opportunity to be hurt by it need the greatest opportunity to comment on it.

The new agreement, with congressional approval, would expand free trade to Latin American countries, including a long-planned expansion to Chile. It comes as the United States still is getting used to the global economy brought about by the 1994 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and could be followed by free-trade agreements in the Pacific Rim.

Still being negotiated through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, is something called the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). Already, the MAI's blinding complexity and invitation for international abuse has set watchdog groups to howling, with justification. MAI could make every nation a most-favored trading partner and forbid states from interferring with business conducted within their own borders. It may also, according to Public Citizen, allow for the first time corporations to sue nations for failing to meet MAI terms.

The cumulative effect of tearing down trading walls the world over is not yet known. That makes a thorough debate and a willingness to amend treaties a healthy approach for the United States in its global dealings. Save fast tracks for the railroads.

Pittsburgh-Post-Gazette

CLINTON ON TRACK PRESIDENT SEEKS CRUCIAL AUTHORITY FOR FREE-TRADE PACT

08/26/97

(Copyright 1997)

In his weekly radio address on Saturday, President Clinton asked Congress to give him the so-called "fast-track" authority to negotiate free-trade agreements around the globe, starting with Chile. It's about time.

Fast-track legislation is regarded as a prerequisite to trade negotiations, amounting to a pledge by Congress to avoid tinkering with any resulting treaty. Under a fast-track legislative authority, Congress merely votes any resulting treaty up or down - as was the case with the North American Free Trade Agreement reached with Mexico and Canada in the fall of 1993.

In the past few years, preoccupied with his re-election effort, President Clinton did not place further trade negotiations atop his priority list. This made sense in terms of domestic politics, given that some of the most traditionally active groups within Democratic politics - organized labor, for one - were still smarting from the battle over NAFTA, which they had opposed.

But the administration's procrastination on trade matters has hurt the nation's credibility on the international front, particularly in the aftermath of President Clinton's ambitious call for a "Free Trade of the Americas" at the 1994 Latin American summit in Miami. Absent any follow-through from Washington, most Latin American nations have simply proceeded to negotiate free-trade agreements with the European Union and with each other.

In the not-too-distant past, the United States was, rightly in our view, free trade's staunchest proponent around the world. Indeed, as late as 1988, Mexico's government was still rebuffing Washington's decades-long push for a free-trade agreement.

Now, Americans are fortunate that in this moment in history, a rare free-trade consensus has emerged in this hemisphere as it has elsewhere in the world. This consensus should not go unappreciated because a vocal minority in this country would like to set back the clock and deny reality. History has taught that the expansion of trade spreads wealth, while the building of trade barriers merely contains economic stagnation.

Chile, Latin America's most prosperous and democratic society, can testify to that. It opened up its economy before most of its neighbors did.

For his part, President Clinton is right to recognize that, with its marketing and technological genius, the United States can only gain from greater access to foreign markets. Even if he must split his party on this issue, the president must do the right thing and live up to this nation's historic commitment.

September 4, 1997

ACTION MEMORANDUM

To: Ann Lewis
Jay Berman
Vicky Raad

From: Dan Lesmez
Peter O'Keefe
Dave Levy

Re: Fast Track Roll-out Event Success Stories

We may need to convene a short meeting to narrow the selection for the two "Success Stories" to be included in the President's Fast Track roll-out event on September 10th. There are two candidates to choose from to represent a small high technology export company. For the agriculture/bio-tech story, the selection is quite simple as we only have one farmer.

Hi-Tech Companies:

1) Contact: Susan Corrales-Diaz, President and CEO
Systems Integrated
Orange, California
(714) 634-0600

- Systems Integrated, a $50 million company, provides intelligent data acquisition systems and products to improve the efficiency and control of hydroelectric power generation, distribution automation, substation automation, and automated meter monitoring in its predominant East-Asian market. It also provides water management and distribution systems, and waste water facility-systems. Ten years ago, Systems Integrated entered the international marketplace as it began phasing down its U.S. military contract business, a move that proved critical to avert layoffs. Its export market has allowed it to maintain its highly technical staff of almost 100 people in place while steadily growing its international business sales to its current level of 30 percent of total revenues. In view of the two-year average lead time for implementing its large-size contracts overseas, Systems Integrated anticipates sales from exports rising to 50 percent within the next two years.
(Source: White House)

[ ] Approve [ ] Disapprove

2) Contact: Tom Ory, President
Daedulus Enterprises, Inc.
Ann Arbor, Michigan
(313) 769-5649

- Daedulus Enterprises, Inc. is a manufacturer of highly specialized remote sensing systems worldwide. In business for 30 years, it has tapped a global demand for its product in uses as varied as waterborne pollution sensing to drug interdiction efforts. Its exports sales range at about 70 percent of total sales annually and directly support five-to-ten employees (out of a total of 17 employees). Daedulus earned over $1.2 million in revenue from exports in 1996 and $1.4 million this year. It depends on 2 or 3 large contracts per year, often involving foreign governments, and is facing increased pressure from foreign competitors who are already benefiting from government subsidies to lower financing costs. Daedulus stands to lose business opportunities in Asia and other parts of the world, if the U.S. is unable to negotiate trade agreements while its European competitors benefit from their countries negotiated trade agreements with other nations. (Note: Mr. Ory was uninformed about the implications of Fast Track for his business, although he is well aware of unfair competition as Daedulus encounters it frequently with its foreign competitors who receive subsidies from their governments to lower their bids. Once I walked him through it, he understood the increased risk that his company faces if the President is not provided Fast Track authority).
(Source: Department of Commerce)

[ ] Approve [ ] Disapprove

Agriculture/Bio-Tech.:

Contact: Eugene (Gene) Lang, Farmer (also sons Ron and Curt for background)
Grinell, Iowa
(515) 236-8466

- Mr. Lang and his sons operate a 1,300 acre farm (medium-size) that helps support them and their families. They grow corn and soybean using hybrid seeds that increase yields, hence increase the amount of product available for export. Based on national averages, Mr. Lang estimates that 20 percent of his corn sales and 30 to 35 percent of his soybean sales are derived from exports. As with most farmers, Mr. Lang sells his product to the operators of the grain elevators, who process the commodities and sell them domestically and internationally. Mr. Lang is a skilled public speaker who has been recommended by Pioneer Hi-Bred international, a leading biotechnology company that supplies him with bio-tech seeds. Mr. Lang also benefits from Pioneer's research and expertise, which is consolidated from its operations in about a hundred countries. (Note: USDA likes the idea of having farmer sitting next to the President, and will provide additional background to that individual so that the presentation more fully gauges the impact of exports and bio-technology on agriculture.
(Source: Pioneer Hi-Bred International)

JB
FYI
-JuK

The Business Roundtable

Date August 27, 1997
Number of pages including cover sheet 3

FAX

TO: Peter O'Keefe
The White House
456-7702 (ph)
456-6218 (fx)

FROM: Pat Engman
The Business Roundtable

Phone (202) 872-1260
Fax Phone (202) 466-3509

CC:

REMARKS: ☐ Urgent ☐ For your review ☐ Reply ASAP ☐ Please Comment

The list that follows now includes phone numbers. New information has been added for:

Jones, Wendy/Boeing
Lloyd, Wingate/ITT Industries
Wellman, Arnold/UPS
Shelk, John/ITT (new name)
Van de Water, Read/The Business Roundtable (new name)

As soon as we hear from the remaining three people, we will fax you their information.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. list	The Business Roundtable White House Briefing; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (2 pages)	09/09/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Policy Development
Jason Berman
OA/Box Number: 10603

FOLDER TITLE:

[Fast Track - Miscellaneous] [2]

2017-0401-F
db4721

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE
WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING - SEPTEMBER 9, 1997
INVITE LIST

[001]

	Name	*Company*	*Phone*	*Date of Birth*	*SS No.*
YES	Theodore Austell	Tenneco	(202) 942-0220	[redacted]	[redacted]
YES	Lisa Barry	The Boeing Company	(703) 558-9605	[redacted]	[redacted]
NO	~~John K. Boidock~~	~~Texas Instruments~~	~~(202) 628-3133~~	[redacted]	[redacted]
YES	James T. Christy	TRW Inc.	(703) 276-5030	[redacted]	[redacted]
YES	Ken W. Cole	AlliedSignal Inc.	(202) 662-2670	[redacted]	[redacted]
YES	Don R. Duncan	Phillips Petroleum Company	(202) 833-0907	[redacted]	[redacted]
YES	Patricia Hanahan Engman	The Business Roundtable	(202) 872-1260	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Lynwood Evans Message	U S WEST	(202) 429-3132	[redacted]	[redacted]
	R. Michael Gadbaw YES	General Electric Company	(202) 637-4269	[redacted]	[redacted]
wants substitute	Nicholas J. Glakas	ITT Corporation	(202) 296-6000	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Dave Gribbin Message	Halliburton Company	(202) 223-0820	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Fruzsina M. Harsanyi YES	ABB Inc.	(202) 414-6870	[redacted]	[redacted]
NO	Peter Harty	Merck & Co., Inc.	(908) 423-7705	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Robert Heine Left Message	DuPont Company	(202) 728-3600	[redacted] (b)(6)	[redacted]
	Thomas M. Helscher Left Message	Monsanto Company	(202) 783-2460	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Jessica J. Holliday Message	Air Products & Chemicals	(202) 289-4110	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Jane Fawcett Hoover YES	The Procter & Gamble Co.	(202) 393-3408	[redacted]	[redacted]
	J. Anthony Imler Message	Merck & Co., Inc.	(908) 423-6118	[redacted]	[redacted]
	L. Oakley Johnson Message	American Int'l Group, Inc.	(202) 783-2452	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Michael J. Johnson Message	FMC Corporation	(202) 956-5214	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Ardon B. Judd, Jr. Message	Dresser Industries, Inc.	(202) 296-3070	[redacted]	[redacted]
NO	Wendy M. Kenyon Jones	The Boeing Company	(703) 558-9605	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Michael C. Kerby Voice Mail	Raytheon Company	(703) 416-5800	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Kenneth H. Klein Message	Xerox Corporation	(202) 414-1200	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Mary Lou Lackey Message	Motorola, Inc.	(202) 371-6900	[redacted]	[redacted]
	William C. Lane YES	Caterpillar Inc.	(202) 466-0672	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Charles Levy Message	Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering	(202) 663-6400	[redacted]	[redacted]
	Robert G. Liberatore Message	Chrysler Corporation	(202) 414-6747	[redacted]	[redacted]

Clinton Library Photocopy

	Wingate Lloyd Message	ITT Industries	(202) 216-1794	[redacted]
	Susan Lord YES	Springs Industries, Inc.	(202) 682-4711	
NO	Lisa L. Maher	Chrysler Corporation	(202) 414-6732	
	Ned W. Massee Message	Westvaco	(212) 318-5255	
	Samuel L. Maury YES	The Business Roundtable	(202) 872-1260	
	Chris Padilla YES	Eastman Kodak Company	(202) 857-3463	
	E. Robbins Pancake Message	Hewlett-Packard Company	(202) 884-7012	
	Laird D. Patterson Message	Bethlehem Steel Corporation	(202) 775-6200	
	Sherry E. Peske Message	Foster Wheeler Int'l Corp.	(202) 296-9703	(b)(6)
	James C. Pruitt Message	Texaco Inc.	(202) 331-1427	
NO	Ronald Pump	AT&T	(202) 457-2206	
	Michael R. Riksen Message	Harris Corporation	(703) 739-1939	
	Susan Rochford [illegible]	Honeywell, Inc.	(202) 872-0495	
NO	John Shelk	ITT Corporation	(202) 296-6000	
	Gordon M. Thomas YES	Textron Incorporated	(202) 637-3800	
	Read Van de Water Message	The Business Roundtable	(202) 872-1260	
	Arnold F. Wellman Message	UPS	(202) 675-4251	
	Shirley Zebroski Message	General Motors Corporation	(202) 775-5082	

Clinton Library Photocopy

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. list	Attendees to the Fast Track Briefing; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (3 pages)	09/04/1997	b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Policy Development
Jason Berman
OA/Box Number: 10603

FOLDER TITLE:

[Fast Track - Miscellaneous] [2]

2017-0401-F
db4721

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

JB – F41 – JUK

ATTENDEES TO THE SEPTEMBER 4TH FASTTRACT BRIEFING

Daniel Amstutz
National American Export Grain Assn.

Karen Fegley
Wheat Export Trade Education Cmte.

[redacted] (b)(6)

[002]

Andrew Barbour
Grocery Manufacturers of America

Nancy Foster
American Crop Protection Assn.

[redacted] (b)(6)

J. Patrick Boyle
American Meat Institute

Rebecca Frailey
Continental Grain Company

[redacted] (b)(6)

James Clawson
Wine Institute

Floyd Gaibler
Agricultural Retailers Assn.

[redacted] (b)(6)

Len Condon
American Meat Institute

Nick Giordano
National Pork Producers Council

[redacted] (b)(6)

Chuck Conner
Corn Refiners Association

Kenneth Hobbie
U.S. Feed Grains Council

[redacted] (b)(6)

James Crenney, Jr.
U.S. Apple Association

Milton Hunt
American Crop Protection Assn.

[redacted] (b)(6)

Steven Eure
National Milk Producers Federation

Randy Jones
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives

[redacted] (b)(6)

Clinton Library Photocopy

Allen Johnson National Oilseed Processors Assn.	Luther Markwart American Sugarbeet Growers Assn.
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Celestas Jurkovich Chicago Board of Trade	Larry Meyers American Sheep Industry Assn.
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Kendall Keith National Grain and Feed Assn.	Donald Nelson Phillip Morris Corp.
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Susan Keith National Corn Growers Assn.	Bonnie Raquet Cargill
[redacted] (b)(6)	
G. Chandler Keys, III National Cattlemen's Beef Assn.	Randall Russell Lesher & Russell
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Robert Koch Wine Institute	John Roney American Sugar Alliance
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Charles Lambert National Cattlemen's Beef Assn.	Tom Rugg National Grange
[redacted] (b)(6)	
William Lesher Lesher & Russell	Richard Schroeder Heron and Associates
[redacted] (b)(6)	
Alfred J. Maguire III National Cotton Council	Carl Schwensen National Assn. of Wheat Growers
[redacted] (b)(6)	

Clinton Library Photocopy

Scott Shearer
Farmland Industries, Inc.

Michael Wootten
Sunkist

[redacted] (b)(6)

Martin Sorkin
Archer Daniels Midland

Dalton Yancey
Texas, Florida, and Hawaiian Sugar

[redacted] (b)(6)

Barbara Spangler
American Farm Bureau Federation

Nancy Yanish
Food Marketing Institute

[redacted] (b)(6)

Ann Tutwiler
Central Soya
[redacted] (b)(6)

Connie Tipton
International Dairy Foods Assn.
[redacted] (b)(6)

Alan Tracy
U.S. Wheat Association, Inc.
[redacted] (b)(6)

Peter Vitaliano
National Milk Producers Federation
[redacted] (b)(6)

Mary Waters
ConAgra
[redacted] (b)(6)

Ford West
Fertilizer Institute
[redacted] (b)(6)

Clinton Library Photocopy

NON-LABOR/ENVIRONMENT
TERMS OF THE FAST TRACK LEGISLATION
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
(For Cabinet meetings with Democratic Members)

Duration

Q: What is the duration of the fast track authority the Administration is seeking?

A: The Administration is likely to seek fast track authority lasting until October 1, 2005. This duration is consistent with some past grants of authority by Congress. This duration gives our trading partners confidence that the U.S. will be able to continue market opening initiatives that may take years to complete (e.g., FTAA, APEC). Without longer-term authority, countries may not be willing to start a longer-term process, crippling our ability to reduce foreign trade barriers.

Background: This duration corresponds to the deadline set for the completion date of the Free Trade Area of the Americas process in 2005. Although it extends beyond President Clinton's tenure (through the next President's first term), this is necessary to give us credibility in long-term negotiations. The October 1, 2005 date puts the President newly elected in 2004 in the strongest position to secure an extension of authority in 2005.

Scope of Provisions in Implementing Bill

Q: I understand some want to limit the provisions of any trade agreement implementing bill only to those provisions absolutely necessary to implement the agreement. What will the Administration's legislation provide?

A: We favor retaining the authority given to past Administrations to include in such legislation provisions that are "necessary or appropriate" to implement the trade agreement. This would permit provisions that are not absolutely necessary to implement the agreement, but are ancillary to implementation (e.g., authority to monitor the results of the agreement) or necessary to secure the required votes for passage. We believe the Administration needs that flexibility. Negotiations on this matter continue.

Background: This issue relates to what provisions may be included in future legislation implementing free trade agreements (not in the fast track legislation currently being considered). Some Republicans objected that the NAFTA and Uruguay Round implementing bills included too many extraneous provisions (e.g., North American Development Bank) that were not necessary to implement these agreements and they seek to limit the ability to include such provisions in future implementing bills. However, limiting future bills only to "necessary" provisions would straightjacket efforts by the Administration and its Congressional supporters to secure the votes for passage and to add other appropriate provisions. Other Congressional Members also favor broad flexibility to incorporate provisions they favor (e.g., dumping law amendments) in future implementing legislation. Discussions continue with Congressional leaders as to the extent of flexibility to be provided.

Other Free Trade Agreements

Q: What other bilateral free trade agreements do you envision negotiating?

A: The Administration would use this authority to break down foreign barriers in a number of ways, not just through free trade agreements. These include:

- Multilateral: Negotiations are scheduled in the WTO to break down global barriers in key areas, like agriculture and services, in which the U.S. has substantial trade surpluses already.
- Sectoral: We would pursue negotiations to open markets in sectors in which the U.S. is highly competitive, such as information technology products, medical equipment and environmental technology.
- Regional: We would also continue our efforts to open the markets of Latin America and Asia, the two fastest growing regions of the world. We need fast track authority to continue these broad and long-term processes. At this point, the only bilateral free trade agreement we envision completing is with Chile, but we would welcome your views on what other countries we might consider.

Fast Track Generally

Q: Doesn't the fast track process deprive Congress its rightful role in trade matters?

A: The fast track process actually ensure Congress a central role in trade negotiations. For over twenty years, Congress has used fast track to set negotiating objectives, to oversee the conduct of negotiations, to establish by statute procedures for advising the President, and to ensure Congress is apprised of how the agreements will be implemented. Fast track implementing bills are written jointly with each Congressional committee of jurisdiction. All five of the fast track trade agreements submitted to the Congress since 1979 have been approved, most by overwhelming majorities. This would not have happened if those procedures did not produce agreements in America's interests and if they did not respect Congressional prerogatives and democratic traditions.

Congressional Consultations

Q: The Administration has not consulted adequately with Congress on these trade agreements. What will your proposal provide to remedy that?

A: We take the need to consult with Congress very seriously. In the President's first term, USTR officials alone consulted with members of Congress and their staffs literally thousands of times.

The legislation we will submit envisions substantial consultations with Congress at every step along the way - before, during and after trade agreement negotiations. In fact, there will even be a provision permitting Congress to withdraw fast track authority from the Administration if it fails or refuses to consult. We take consultations seriously. If at any time you feel we are not doing enough, please tell us.

Background: The Administration's bill will contain various provisions regarding consultation. These include notice and consultations with the Ways & Means and Finance Committees and other appropriate committees to the start of negotiations; notification to Congress before to signing an agreement, plus Federal Register notice and consultations with all committees of jurisdiction; and a provision permitting Congress to repeal fast track authority if the Administration fails to consult adequately prior to signing agreements.

NORTH AMERICAN AGREEMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATION: A PRIMER

HISTORICAL UNDERTAKING: The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC) is the first environmental agreement specifically associated with a trade agreement. It is designed to ensure that expanded trade contributes to strong environmental protection in North America.

SCOPE: Any environmental or natural resource issue may be addressed through a work program under the Agreement, and any environmental concern or obligation of the agreement may be the subject of consultations between parties.

ENVIRONMENTAL OBLIGATIONS: The NAAEC requires NAFTA partners to undertake specific obligations regarding the development, implementation, and enforcement of their environmental laws:

- Guarantee citizens access to national courts to petition governments to undertake enforcement actions and to seek redress of harm.
- Ensure the openness of judicial and administrative proceedings and transparent procedures for the creation of environmental laws and regulations.
- Pledge that national laws and standards will continue to provide high levels of environmental protection and to work cooperatively in enhancing protections.
- Effectively enforce national environmental laws and submit this commitment to a dispute settlement process.
- Commit to report on the state of the domestic environment and to promote environmental education, scientific research, and technological development.
- Work toward limiting trade in toxic substances that they have banned domestically.

The Agreement does not affect the rights of states and provinces under the NAFTA to maintain standards at levels higher than the Federal Governments.

COOPERATION AGENDA: A major goal of the Agreement is to broaden cooperative activities among the NAFTA partners designed to:

- Consider the environmental implications of process and production methods.
- Promote greater public access to information about hazardous substances ("community right-to-know").
- Consider ways to promote the assessment and mitigation of transboundary environmental

problems.

INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATION: The Agreement is administered by the Commission on Environmental Cooperation (CEC), which was created specifically for that purpose.

- The top environmental official in each country (the EPA Administrator for the United States) comprises the Commission's Council.
- The heart of the Commission is the Secretariat. The Executive Director of the Secretariat takes broad direction from the Council. but maintain a high degree of independence.
- A Joint Advisory Committee made up of nongovernmental organizations from all three countries advises the Council in its deliberations.
- The Commission will serve as a point of enquiry for public concerns about NAFTA's effect on the environment, and be an avenue for NAFTA dispute settlement panels to obtain environmental expertise when faced with environmental issues.

OVERSIGHT OF NATIONAL ENFORCEMENT: Transparency is the hallmark of the agreement. Citizens of member countries are entitled to make submissions related to the full range of environmental issues.

- The Commission's Secretariat must act on submissions appropriately to develop fact-finding reports. The reports must be made public if any two of the three NAFTA countries concur.
- The agreement creates a consultative process for the Council to discuss issues, including those brought to light through the public submission process and the Secretariat's fact-finding activities.
- In the event that one Party considers that another Party has persistently failed to effectively enforce its environmental laws (affecting a sector involving traded goods or services), the matter may be referred to a dispute settlement panel when consultations fail to resolve the matter.
- The dispute settlement process provides for sanctions in the form of monetary compensation or withdrawal of trade privileges if members fail to correct problems of nonenforcement.

Members of the U.S. Senate 105th Congress: Positions On Trade

Senator's Name	Fast Track	NAFTA	GATT	1	2	3	4	5
New Hampshire								
Sen. Judd Gregg (R-NH-S2)		Y	Y					
Sen. Robert C. Smith (R-NH-S1)	Y	N	Y					
New Jersey								
Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg (D-NJ-S1)	Y	N	Y					
Sen. Robert G. Torricelli (D-NJ-S2)	Y	N	Y					
New Mexico								
Sen. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM-S2)	Y	Y	Y					
Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-NM-S1)	Y	Y	Y					
Nevada								
Sen. Richard H. Bryan (D-NV-S2)	Y	N	N					
Sen. Harry Reid (D-NV-S1)	N	N	N					
New York								
Sen. Alfonse M. D'Amato (R-NY-S2)	Y	N	Y					
Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-NY-S1	N	N	Y					
Ohio								
Sen. Mike DeWine (R-OH-S2)								
Sen. John Glenn (D-OH-S1)	N	N	Y					
Oklahoma								
Sen. James M. Inhofe (R-OK-S2)	Y	N	N					
Sen. Don Nickles (R-OK-S1)	Y	Y	Y					
Oregon								
Sen. Gordon H. Smith (R-OR-S2)								
Sen. Ron Wyden (D-OR-S1)	Y	Y	Y					
Pennslyvania								
Sen. Rick Santorum (R-PA-S2)	Y	N	N					
Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA-S1)	N	Y	Y					
Rhode Island								
Sen. John H. Chafee (R-RI-S1)								
Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI-S2)	N	N	Y					
South Carolina								
Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D-SC-S2)	N	N	N					
Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-SC-S1)	N	N	N					
South Dakota								
Sen. Tom Daschle (D-SD-S1)	N	Y	Y					
Sen. Tim Johnson (D-SD-S2)	N	N	Y					
Tennessee								
Sen. Bill Frist (R-TN-S2)								
Sen. Fred Thompson (R-TN-S1)								
Texas								
Sen. Phil Gramm (R-TX-S1)		Y	Y					
Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX-S2)	Y	Y	Y					
Utah								
Sen. Robert F. Bennett (R-UT-S2)		Y	Y					
Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-UT-S1)	Y	Y	Y					
Virginia								
Sen. Charles S. Robb (D-VA-S2)	Y	Y	Y					
Sen. John W. Warner (R-VA-S1)	Y	Y	Y					

*A blank space indicates the Senator did not vote, or had not been elected at that time.

Members of the U.S. Senate 105th Congress: Positions On Trade

Senator's Name	Fast Track	NAFTA	GATT	1	2	3	4	5
Vermont								
Sen. James M. Jeffords (R-VT-S2)	N	Y	N					
Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-VT-S1)	N	Y	N					
Washington								
Sen. Slade Gorton (R-WA-S1)	Y	Y	Y					
Sen. Patty Murray (D-WA-S2)		Y	Y					
Wisconsin								
Sen. Russell D. Feingold (D-WI-S2)		N	N					
Sen. Herb Kohl (D-WI-S1)	Y	N	Y					
West Virginia								
Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-WV-S1)	N	N	N					
Sen. John D. Rockefeller (D-WV-S2)	Y	Y	Y					
Wyoming								
Sen. Michael B. Enzi (R-WY-S2)								
Sen. Craig Thomas (R-WY-S1)	Y	Y	Y					

*A blank space indicates the Senator did not vote, or had not been elected at that time.

**147 REPRESENTATIVES WHO DID NOT VOTE ON
1991 FAST TRACK, NAFTA AND GATT**

Bob Riley (R-AL-03)
Robert Aderholt (R-AL-04)

Matt Salmon (R-AZ-01)
John Shadegg (R-AZ-04)
J.D. Hayworth (R-AZ-06)

Marion Berry (D-AR-01)
Vic Snyder (D-AR-02)
Asa Hutchinson (R-AR-03)

Frank Riggs (R-CA-01)
Ellen Tauscher (D-CA-10)
Tom Campbell (R-CA-15)
Zoe Lofgren (D-CA-16)
George Radanovich (R-CA-19)
Walter Capps (D-CA-22)
Brad Sherman (D-CA-24)
James Rogan (R-CA-27)
Juanita Millender-McDonald (D-CA-37)
Sonny Bono (R-CA-44)
Loretta Sanchez (D-CA-46)
Brian Bilbray (R-CA-49)

Diana DeGette (D-CO-01)
Robert Schaffer (R-CO-04)

James Maloney (D-CT-05)

Joe Scarborough (R-FL-01)
Allen Boyd (D-FL-02)
Jim Davis (D-FL-11)
Dave Weldon (R-FL-15)
Mark Foley (R-FL-16)
Robert Wexler (D-FL-19)

Bob Barr (R-GA-07)
Saxby Chambliss (R-GA-08)
Charlie Norwood (R-GA-10)

Helen Chenoweth (R-ID-01)

Jesse Jackson, Jr. (D-IL-02)
Rod Blagojevich (D-IL-05)
Danny Davis (D-IL-07)
Jerry Weller (R-IL-11)
Ray LaHood (R-IL-18)
John Shimkus (R-IL-20)

David McIntosh (R-IN-02)
Mark Souder (R-IN-04)
Edward Pease (R-IN-07)
John Hostettler (R-IN-08)
Julia Carson (D-IN-10)

Leonard Boswell (D-IA-03)
Greg Ganske (R-IA-04)
Tom Latham (R-IA-05)

Jerry Moran (R-KS-01)
Jim Ryun (R-KS-02)
Vince Snowbarger (R-KS-03)
Todd Tiahrt (R-KS-04)

Edward Whitfield (R-KY-01)
Anne Northup (R-KY-03)

John Cooksey (R-LA-05)
Chris John (D-LA-07)

Thomas Allen (D-ME-01)
John Baldacci (D-ME-02)

Robert Ehrlich (R-MD-02)
Elijah Cummings (D-MD-07)

James McGovern (D-MA-03)
John Tierney (D-MA-06)
William Delahunt (D-MA-10)

Debbie Stabenow (D-MI-08)
Lynn Rivers (D-MI-13)
Carolyn C. Kilpatrick (D-MI-15)

Gil Gutknecht (R-MN-01)
Bill Luther (D-MN-06)

Roger Wicker (R-MS-01)
Charles Pickering (R-MS-03)

Karen McCarthy (D-MO-05)
Roy Blunt (R-MO-07)
JoAnn Emerson (R-MO-08)
Kenny Hulshof (R-MO-09)

Rick Hill (R-MT-01)

Jon Christensen (R-NE-02)

John Ensign (R-NV-01)
Jim Gibbons (R-NV-02)

John E. Sununu (R-NH-01)
Charles Bass (R-NH-02)

Frank LoBiondo (R-NJ-02)
William Pascrell (D-NJ-08)
Steven Rothman (D-NJ-09)
Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ-11)
Mike Pappas (R-NJ-12)

Bill Redmond (R-NM-03)

Michael Forbes (R-NY-01)
Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY-04)
Sue Kelly (R-NY-19)

Bob Etheridge (D-NC-02)
Walter Jones (R-NC-03)
Richard Burr (R-NC-05)
Mike McIntyre (D-NC-07)
Sue Myrick (R-NC-09)

Steve Chabot (R-OH-01)
Dennis Kucinich (D-OH-10)
Bob Ney (R-OH-18)
Steve LaTourette (R-OH-19)

Tom Coburn (R-OK-02)
Wes Watkins (R-OK-03)
J.C. Watts (R-OK-04)

Earl Blumenauer (D-OR-03)
Darlene Hooley (D-OR-05)

Chaka Fattah (D-PA-02)
John Peterson (R-PA-05)
Jon Fox (R-PA-13)
Joseph Pitts (R-PA-16)
Mike Doyle (D-PA-18)
Frank Mascara (D-PA-20)
Phil English (R-PA-21)

Patrick Kennedy (D-RI-01)
Robert Weygand (D-RI-02)

Mark Sanford (R-SC-01)
Lindsay Graham (R-SC-03)

John Thune (R-SD-01)

William Jenkins (R-TN-01)
Zach Wamp (R-TN-03)
Van Hilleary (R-TN-04)
Ed Bryant (R-TN-07)
Harold Ford, Jr. (D-TN-09)

Max Sandlin (D-TX-01)
Jim Turner (D-TX-02)
Pete Sessions (R-TX-05)
Kevin Brady (R-TX-08)
Nick Lampson (D-TX-09)
Lloyd Doggett (D-TX-10)
Kay Granger (R-TX-12)
Mac Thornberry (R-TX-13)
Ron Paul (R-TX-14)
Ruben Hinojosa (D-TX-15)
Silvestre Reyes (D-TX-16)
Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX-18)
Ken Bentsen (D-TX-25)
Ciro Rodriguez (D-TX-28)

Merrill Cook (R-UT-02)
Chris Cannon (R-UT-03)

Virgil Goode (D-VA-05)
Tom Davis (R-VA-11)

Rick White (R-WA-01)
Jack Metcalf (R-WA-02)
Linda Smith (R-WA-03)
Doc Hastings (R-WA-04)
George Nethercutt (R-WA-05)
Adam Smith (D-WA-09)

Mark Neumann (R-WI-01)
Ron Kind (D-WI-03)
Jay Johnson (D-WI-08)

Barbara Cubin (R-WY-01)

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Date:

To: ______________

From: Jason Berman
x62694

Tauscher Letter

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.

Published on September 2, 1997

Fast track for president

ONE OF THE FIRST and most important decisions Congress will be asked to make when it returns from summer recess is whether to reinstate President Clinton's fast-track power to make trade agreements. It should be an easy yes vote, but unfortunately, it will not be.

As Rep. Ellen Tauscher, D-Tassajara Valley, told the Times on Thursday, an odd combination of liberal Democrats catering to labor leaders and right-wing xenophobic Republicans oppose fast track. They mistakenly fear the administration will make trade deals that harm U.S. workers.

Nothing could be further from the truth. From 1974 to 1994, Democratic and Republican presidents have enjoyed fast-track power, allowing them to negotiate a number of trade agreements that have boosted the U.S. economy and created good-paying jobs for Americans.

The executive branch of the government needs to have fast track back so it can continue to make trade agreements in a timely manner. Fast track allows the administration to negotiate trade accords that Congress could approve or disapprove, but not amend.

The reality is that if Congress is allowed to change the contents of agreements, negotiations would never end. It simply is impractical for 535 people in Congress to thrash out the details of trade agreements. To be timely and effective, that authority must be delegated, just as union members delegate to their leaders the authority to work out labor contracts with business leaders.

If Teamster leaders did not have such authority, one wonders if they ever could have negotiated such a positive deal for UPS workers.

Giving Clinton fast-track authority is not an abdication of the democratic process as opponents claim. Congress will have the final say on any trade agreement, and certainly individual members of Congress can make their thoughts on trade pacts known to the administration before any deal is made.

The real agenda of those opposed to fast track is to prevent the United States from entering into trade pacts like the North America Free Trade Agreement, which they erroneously claim has hurt American workers. It has not. A comprehensive, nonpartisan study by researchers at UCLA found that NAFTA has resulted in a net gain of jobs for the United States and that jobs that support exports paid better than those that were shifted to Mexico.

Over the last four years overseas trade has accounted for one-fourth of our economic growth and half of our new jobs. Today, U.S. exports account for 11 million good American jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers beyond U.S. borders, free and fair trade agreements are essential for our economic future. But we are falling behind. In the past five years, the United States has been left out of 20 important trade pacts in Asia and Latin America.

As with NAFTA, Clinton needs bipartisan support to regain fast-track trade authority. That means members of Congress will have to put parochialism and partisanship aside and vote to give the administration the power it needs to further America's economic success in foreign trade.

Edition: CCT, Section: A, Page: 11

© 1997 Contra Costa Newspapers Inc.