

this legislation and my appreciation to Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Ranking Member CONYERS for their bipartisan leadership in bringing it to the floor.

Nearly 20 years ago, Congress passed legislation known as the National Cooperative Research Act of 1984 which permitted certain cooperative ventures to reduce their exposure to treble damages currently provided for under antitrust laws by making advance disclosures of their activities. The bill before us would provide similar relief to nonprofit organizations that develop voluntary technical standards, known as standards-development organizations, or commonly referred to as SDOs. As the chairman indicated, these standards developed by these organizations play an essential role in enhancing public safety, facilitating market access, and promoting trade and innovation.

Yet despite these pro-competitive effects, these SDOs can find themselves named as defendants in suits between business competitors alleging violations of the antitrust laws. Once they are sued, these organizations are forced to expend considerable resources on protracted discovery proceedings before they are finally able to prevail on motions for summary judgment which occurs in 100 percent of the cases, from my information.

The bill, like the National Cooperative Research Act before it, takes a moderate approach to addressing this problem. It does not create, as the chairman indicated, a statutory exemption or confer immunity from the operation of the antitrust laws. Most significantly, it merely “de-trebles” antitrust damages in cases where accurate predisclosure of collaborative activities has been made to the Department of Justice and the FTC.

I think this is the right approach. Congress should allow the antitrust laws to operate as they were meant to, without creating special exemptions and carve-outs for particular industries. This bill does not create an exemption for SDOs. Instead, it grants them limited relief of the same type and in the same manner as the relief provided for by the National Cooperative Research Act to certain cooperative joint ventures. It is a moderate approach, and it has worked well.

Again, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for their cooperative joint venture in support of this bill. I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of my good friend, Jim Shannon, a former Member of this body and former Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He currently serves as president and CEO of the National Fire Protection Association, an international organization that develops the fire safety codes and standards that protect all of us. The NFPA just happens to be based in my hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts; and Jim Shannon and this fine organi-

zation have worked very hard to advance this legislation. I want to acknowledge their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation offered by Mr. SENSENBRENNER. We have worked hard, along with a number of standard development organizations, technology companies and other private interests to craft a bill that will provide some important protections to encourage nonprofit standard development organizations, or SDOs, to continue their critical work of collaborating to set pro-competitive standards in this industries. SDOs set thousands of standards that keep us safe and provide uniformity for everything from fire protections to computer systems to building construction, for example.

This bill provides a commonsense safe harbor for standard development organizations. Those that voluntarily disclose their activities to federal antitrust authorities will only be subject to single damages should a lawsuit later arise. Those who refuse to disclose their activities, or those who take actions beyond their disclosure, will still be subject to treble damages under the antitrust statutes. This bill does not exempt anyone from the antitrust laws, but it does apply the rule of reason to SDOs. Therefore the procompetitive market effects will be balanced against the anticompetitive market effects of an action before a violation of the antitrust laws is found. Organizations that commit *per se* violations—making agreements or standards about price, market share or territory division, for example—will still be fully liable for their actions.

The rationale for such favored treatment is the SDOs, as nonprofits that serve a cross-section of an industry, are unlikely themselves to engage in anticompetitive activities. However, if free from the threat of treble damages, they can increase efficiency and facilitate the gathering of a wealth of technical expertise from a wide array of interests to enhance product quality and safety while reducing costs.

This is the third bipartisan bill in the last 20 years that has provided some limitation on damages for antitrust liability in order to encourage cooperative behaviors by entities seeking to engage in procompetitive activities. This policy has worked well for research and joint ventures under the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 and I trust it will improve the creative environment for standards setting organizations as well. An expansion of this policy to standard development organizations will allow them to improve their innovative efforts, involve a wider range of industries and technical entities, and improve product safety and development.

I'd like to thank the chairman for his cooperative efforts on this bill and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I support H.R. 1086, “The Standards Development Organization Advancement Act of 2003.”

This act amends the National Cooperative Standards Development Act to provide antitrust protections to specific activities of standard development organizations (SDOs) relating to the development of voluntary consensus standards. Among other provisions, H.R. 1086 amends the NCRA to limit the recovery of antitrust damages against SDOs if the organi-

zations predisclose the nature and scope of their standards development activity to the proper antitrust authorities. H.R. 1086 also amends the NCRA to include SDOs in the framework of NCRA that awards reasonable attorneys' fees to the substantially prevailing party.

The provisions of H.R. 1086 protect SDOs, and in turn, SDOs help protect consumers and the public. SDOs are nonprofit organizations that establish voluntary industry standards. These standards ensure competition within various industries, promote manufacturing compatibility, and reduce the risk that consumers will be stranded with a product that is incompatible with products from other manufacturers.

The nature of the standards development process requires competing companies to bring their competitive ideas to the voluntary standards development process. When one of the companies believes its market position has been compromised by the standards development process that company will likely resort to litigation. It is not uncommon for the SDO to be named as a defendant. For nonprofit organizations like SDOs, litigation can be very costly and disruptive to their operations, and treble antitrust damages can be financially crippling.

Under H.R. 1086, the recovery of damages against SDOs is limited of the organizations prediscloses the nature and scope of their standards development activity to the proper antitrust authorities. Furthermore, SDOs are only liable for treble damages under antitrust laws if they fail to disclose the nature and scope of their voluntary standards setting activity.

H.R. 1086 strikes a good balance. It does not grant SDOs full antitrust immunity, but it provides SDOs' with protection from treble damages when they provide proper disclosure.

H.R. 1086 also benefits the consumer. It enables the SDOs to develop industry standards that promote price competition, intensify corporate rivalry, and encourage the development of new products.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1086, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1086, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE SUPPORTING UNITED STATES IN ITS EFFORTS IN WTO TO END EUROPEAN UNION'S TRADE PRACTICES REGARDING BIOTECHNOLOGY

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 252) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the United States in its efforts

within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's protectionist and discriminatory trade practices of the past five years regarding agricultural biotechnology, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 252

Whereas agriculture biotechnology has been subject to the strictest testing, based on sound science, by the United States Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency prior to commercialization or human consumption;

Whereas Americans have been consuming genetically-modified corn and soybean products, which are subject to a rigorous Federal review process, for years with no documentation of any adverse health consequences;

Whereas, according to recent studies, biotechnology has made substantial contributions to the protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides, reducing soil erosion and creating an environment more hospitable to wildlife;

Whereas agriculture biotechnology holds tremendous promise for helping solve food security and human health crises in the developing world;

Whereas there is objective and experience-based agreement in the scientific community, including the National Academies of Science, the American Medical Association, the Royal Society of the United Kingdom, the French Academy of Medicine, the French Academy of Sciences, the joint report of the national science academies of the United Kingdom, the United States, Brazil, China, India and Mexico, twenty Nobel Prize winners, leading plant science and biology organizations in the United States and thousands of individual scientists, that biotech foods are safe and valuable;

Whereas European Union decisions on agriculture and food biotechnology are being driven by policies that have no scientific justification, do not take into account its capacity for solving problems facing mankind, and are critical of the leading role of the United States in scientific advancement;

Whereas since the late 1990s, the European Union has opposed the use of agriculture biotechnology and pursued policies which result in slowing the development and support of genetically-engineered products around the world;

Whereas the five-year moratorium on the approval of new agriculture biotechnology products entering the European market has no scientific basis, effectively prohibits most United States corn exports to Europe, violates European Union law, and clearly breaches World Trade Organization (WTO) rules;

Whereas since its implementation in October 1998, the moratorium has blocked more than \$300,000,000 annually in United States corn exports to countries in the European Union;

Whereas the European Union's unjustified moratorium on agriculture biotech approvals has ramifications far beyond the United States and Europe, forcing a slowdown in the adoption and acceptance of beneficial biotechnology to the detriment of starving people around the world; and

Whereas in the fall of 2002 it was reported that famine-stricken African countries rejected humanitarian food aid from the United States because of ill-informed health and environmental concerns and fear that future exports to the European Union would be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports and applauds the efforts of the

Administration on behalf of the Nation's farmers and sound science by challenging the long-standing, unwarranted moratorium imposed in the European Union on agriculture and food biotech products and encourages the President to continue to press this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield my self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 252 introduced by my good friend from Missouri, Majority Whip Roy Blunt. This important resolution expresses support for the administration's World Trade Organization case against the European Union's unwarranted moratorium on agriculture and food biotech products.

On May 13, 2003, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick and Agriculture Secretary Ann Veneman announced that the United States, Argentina, Canada, and Egypt would file a WTO case against the European Union over its illegal 5-year moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products. Other countries expressing support for this case by joining it as third parties include Australia, Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, and Uruguay.

Since the late 1990s, the European Union has opposed the use of agriculture biotechnology and pursued policies opposing genetically engineered products around the world. The current 5-year moratorium on the approval of new agriculture biotechnology products entering the European market has no scientific basis, effectively prohibits most United States corn exports to Europe, violates European Union law, and clearly breaches World Trade Organization rules.

According to recent studies, biotechnology has made substantial contributions to the protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides, reducing soil erosion and creating an environment more hospitable to wildlife. Since its implementation in October 1998, the moratorium has blocked more than \$300 million annually in United States corn exports to countries in the European Union. This is completely unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support the administration, sound science, and United States farmers at the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Trade Representative announced that the United States would file a World Trade Organization case against the European Union over its 5-year moratorium on approving genetically modified foods. The measure before us today supports the Bush administration's challenge to the EU's longstanding moratorium.

The European Union is made up of sovereign countries whose citizens have decided that they would rather not eat genetically modified food. Mr. Speaker, when did the United States acquire the right to tell Europeans what they should be eating? The issue before us is not trade discrimination as the proponents of this bill have argued. The individual EU countries are simply debating whether or not to implement a domestic policy related to genetically modified food which would also be applied to imports.

Due to the lack of hard data about the long-term health effects, in the United States there has also been public concern about consuming genetically modified products. According to a Rutgers University Food Policy Institute study, 90 percent of Americans said that foods created through genetic engineering should have labels on them. I am proud to join with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) in his efforts to require the labeling of genetically engineered food.

Although there have been few studies devoted to health effects of genetically modified food, some scientists claim that there may be a link between the resurgence of infectious diseases and genetic modifications in the U.S. food supply. There have even been cases of lab animals suffering immune system damage and allergic reactions after eating biotech food.

I think that Members would agree that the WTO should not interfere with the creation of domestic law in this Chamber, so I ask Members to apply the same principle to our friends in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this heavy-handed measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of H. Res. 252. I commend the gentleman from Missouri for introducing this important resolution.

It is clear that the U.S. must send a strong and unmistakable message to the European Union that its discriminatory and protectionist trade practices regarding biotechnology will not be tolerated. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, this Member asserts that this is an important issue in trans-Atlantic relations. This resolution puts the House on record as supporting the U.S. in its efforts within the World Trade Organization to end these practices.

The EU's current moratorium on approving new agricultural biotech products has no scientific basis.

□ 1300

It harms U.S. agricultural producers and it exacerbates food shortages in Africa. This Member has been strongly

urging the administration to take action on this issue by bringing a case against the EU to the WTO, and is very pleased the announcement has been made that we have done so.

The current EU restrictions on the importation of food with genetically modified organisms, GMOs, have cost agricultural producers billions of dollars in recent years. The U.S. must be aggressive in knocking down such non-tariff trade restrictions.

The EU's delay on lifting the moratorium on biotech crops is unacceptable and the WTO action is certainly appropriate. The intransigence by the EU is having a very detrimental effect on American farmers. It has been reported that since the early 1990s, U.S. corn exports to Europe have plummeted 95 percent, and this issue is one of the causes. Incredibly, too, they have used their emotional arguments against GMOs to coerce African countries facing famine not to accept donated American food and agricultural products. So in contrast to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said, this is strictly not a European issue, this is coercion on their part against African countries who are compelled to leave that food donated to deal with famine and malnutrition setting on the docks.

Also troubling are the indications that the EU is planning to move forward with labeling and traceability requirements that will continue to act as a mechanism to block U.S. agriculture products. This clearly runs counter to the WTO principle that rules should be based on scientific evidence.

I think it is interesting to note that David Byrne, EU Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection, has been quoted as saying, "The EU's position on genetically modified food is that it is as safe as conventional food." However, the moratorium remains in place and American farmers continue to lose valuable markets, not just in Europe, but third world countries. This matters because it is more important to the farmers today facing difficult times due to the ongoing drought and lower revenue.

When filing the WTO case, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick stated clearly why it is so important for the U.S. to take action. He said, "The EU's moratorium violates WTO rules. People around the world have been eating biotech food for years. Biotech food helps nourish the world's hungry population, offers tremendous opportunities for better health and nutrition and protects the environment by reducing soil erosion and pesticide use." This Member believes that the EU's GMO standards are transparently devoid of any relationship to sound science, and are either based strictly on emotion or are designed quite simply as trade barriers, or both.

The U.S. is correct in taking strong action to bring this back to reason. I strongly support H.R. 252 and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA), for his leadership on this matter to protect consumers in this country and also to protect the rights of farmers.

The fact of the matter is that this action would harm U.S. farmers. EU consumers have clearly expressed their desire to buy non-genetically engineered foods. However, the weak U.S. biotech regulations prevent U.S. exports of non-genetically engineered foods because of fears they are contaminated. H. Res. 252 fails to address weak agriculture regulations that leave non-GE food vulnerable to contamination by genetically engineered foods.

EU consumers are clamoring for non-genetically engineered food. All we need to do is to sell them what they want and U.S. farmers will have a strong market again.

When you think about it, U.S. agriculture has been the pride of the world. We have been the breadbasket of the world. Our agriculture is second to none. But of course, when you have these corporate agribusinesses come in with a different agenda, then you see the interests of farmers undermined.

Now, several farm organizations oppose H. Res. 252 because it supports a complaint to the World Trade Organization challenging the EU's authorization system on approving genetically engineered food. H. Res. 252 is a gift to corporate agribusiness. That is why the National Family Farm Coalition, the American Corn Growers Association and the Soybean Producers of America all oppose H. Res. 252.

Family farmers have suffered a great deal of damage to their trade markets because agribusiness pushed a product on U.S. farmers that the people of the world rightfully refused to accept.

The recently completed national survey of corn producers by the American Corn Growers Foundation, conducted as farmers began planting corn in April, shows that farmers do not support this complaint to the WTO. Seventy-six percent of farmers stated that the U.S. should not file a WTO lawsuit against Europe regarding genetically engineered food. Seventy-eight percent of farmers believe in keeping your customers satisfied and in keeping world markets open to U.S. corn, and that means planting traditional non-GMO corn varieties instead of biotech GMO corn varieties. Eighty-two percent of farmers believe that the U.S. Government must respect the rights of Europeans, Japanese, and all consumers worldwide so they are able to make a choice as to whether they and their children consume foods containing genetically engineered commodities.

Only, and I say only, large agribusiness supports the bill and this bill will increase the profits of large agribusiness, and it will do it at the expense of farmers and at the expense of consumers.

This is a time for us to stand up for the American farmer who is having difficulty surviving. Family farmers are having trouble surviving because they cannot get their price and they cannot get access to markets. Both of these are occasioned by the problems brought about by agribusiness and by monopolies in agriculture.

We should stand up for the family farmers and oppose H. Res. 252. We should create policies which enable our family farmers to get those markets in Europe, that we know have belonged to them for so many years, but have been precluded because of the practices of agribusiness.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) for bringing this important resolution to the floor in such a timely fashion. I introduced this resolution 2 weeks ago, and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), our conference chairman, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) for joining me in this effort.

This is a timely effort. It is a discussion we need to have. It is a discussion that, frankly, in the European community has gone on for too long. In October 1998, the European Union did a tremendous disservice to American biotechnology by issuing a ban on the importing of agricultural biotech crops. Although this action was supposed to be a moratorium, it has lasted now for close to 5 years.

In my opinion, this is no longer a moratorium, but a ban which is clearly a violation of Europe's WTO obligations and needs to be reversed as soon as possible.

The damage that this moratorium has done is dramatic, to say the least. For example, since the moratorium went into effect, U.S. corn exports have diminished from a high of 1.56 million metric tons to approximately 23,000 metric tons last year. This has resulted in the loss of close to \$1 billion in corn sales. The tragic thing is that there is no basis, scientific or otherwise, that can justify such an economic hardship on our corn farmers and on other farmers of other products that take advantage of new technology.

On May 13, the administration took the first steps toward rectifying this situation by filing a World Trade Organization case against the European Union over its illegal 5-year moratorium on approving agricultural biotech products. Despite repeated assurances from European officials that the moratorium would be lifted, there is no sign

of any change in policy. In fact, there is ample evidence that this policy will continue.

The position that the European Union and many of its member countries took regarding our efforts to provide food to Africa is also mentioned in this resolution. The idea that starving people would not be allowed to have access to the same kinds of products that American consumers use every day is an idea that is unacceptable.

The Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science, chaired by the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Smith) will be looking carefully at this issue tomorrow, with the Speaker as the leadoff witness.

My colleagues and I introduced House Resolution 252 because we believe that the Bush administration is correct in this area and needs to take the appropriate action on behalf of our Nation's farmers and on behalf of sound science by challenging this moratorium on agriculture and food biotech products.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 252. This bill is not about solving world hunger and it is not about promoting agriculture. What this bill is about is promoting bad policy. This bill goes to the fundamental issues of sovereignty and shifting power from democratically determined public health laws and rules to corporate interests. Ultimately this and chapter 11, the investor state provisions in the North American Free Trade Agreement, in the Singapore and Chilean agreements, probably every other agreement that the Zoellick Trade Representative's office will negotiate, will be used to override all kinds of public health and worker safety laws.

Understand what this is. What we are doing is we are telling the Europeans that they cannot enforce their own food safety laws. The European Union has passed legislation specifically determining what kind of food products, what kinds of food safety laws that they wanted. This resolution is telling them that we have the right in the United States to override what the European Union democratically elected Parliament and democratically determined rules and regulations want to do.

Imagine if the French, the French of all people, or the Germans, came to us and came to the World Trade Organization and said we do not like an environmental law, we do not like a safe drinking water law, a food safety law, that the United States Congress has passed and we want to override it. How dare the French or Germans try to override our public health laws and compromise our sovereignty.

How dare the United States tell the Germans and French and the Poles, new members of the EU and our allies

in the war in Iraq, or anybody else in Europe, how dare we try to override their public health and their public safety laws? Imagine if they did that to us. We have no business saying we know best. We are going to tell you in France, you in Germany, you in Poland, you in England, we are going to tell you what your public safety laws are going to say, what your public health laws are going to say.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to vote no on H. Res. 252.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the Committee on Agriculture and a good colleague.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

This an important discussion. Maybe it would be reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to start out trying to explain what is biotechnology?

Gregor Mendel discovered dominant and recessive traits in plants in the mid 19th century. He started taking two quality plants and crossing them to see if you could come out with an improved variety. So we have had cross-breeding, we have had hybrid breeding ever since. Now we have finished gene cataloguing of an agricultural plant called the *Arabidopsis*, a mustard plant.

But with 25,000 genes, you just took your chances when mixing two plants together. Sometimes the product turned out poisonous or allergenic. Sometimes it was very undesirable for a raft of other reasons.

Now we have the scientific technology to pick out one single gene and decide what characteristics are going to evolve from that gene, and instead of taking your chances by mixing 25,000 or 30,000 genes of two plants, you pick out one gene because you want a certain characteristic. You put it into that other plant and predetermine what is going to happen as a result.

□ 1315

Now, there is a lot of scare of what might happen generations from now. In the discussion of this resolution, it seems to me that we should not be debating whether this is a trade issue. This is now going to be in the hands of the WTO to decide whether or not it is unfair. But everybody, Mr. Speaker, needs to understand, other countries are trying to keep our products out of their country for one reason or another, restricting imports for bio sanitary reasons or anything else they can come up with. And in this case, it appears that they are trying to keep our agricultural products, that we produce more efficiently, out of Europe and Japan and some of these other countries, simply because they do not want it to disrupt the problems of their farmers and they want to protect their markets. We are going to let the WTO decide if it is restraint of trade. But as

we evolve into greater assurance that we are going to have safety, both to human health, to animals, and to the environment, we need to move ahead with this technology.

Look, the possibilities in developing countries are so tremendous. That is why our whip mentioned that the day after tomorrow I am holding a hearing on biotechnology. The Speaker is going to lead off the testimony in that hearing on the potential and safety of biotechnology. We are going to have Rita Caldwell from NSF come to tell us about the implementation of what we put in my NSF bill in terms of working with African scientists, developing products that are going to help their particular country. And if we get into Africa, eventually, science and biotechnology are going to prevail. We are going to have Mr. Natsios, the administrator of AID, say how important it is that we do not restrict this technology for developing countries.

Vote for this resolution and vote to let science, not emotion, rule the future of agricultural biotechnology.

On May 12th, the Speaker of the House and members of Congress joined with the Bush Administration to challenge the European Union's import ban on genetically modified (GM) crops. WTO rules, while allowing countries to reject imports on the basis of health and environmental concerns, require that any such policy be supported by scientific evidence.

However, the EU has refused to process new applications for trade of transgenic food crops since 1998 without even attempting to demonstrate any compelling scientific reasons. It is estimated that over \$300 million annually in U.S. corn exports alone are being lost. Even EU Environment Commissioner Margot Wallstrom has admitted that, "We have already waited too long to act. The moratorium is illegal and not justified."

While the EU stance on GM crops is an unfair economic burden on American farmers, it is also an unjust burden on the world's poorest continent. With approximately 180 million undernourished people, Africa stands to benefit tremendously from GM crops.

The EU is exploiting Africa's dependence on the EU market to stall acceptance of GM crops. For example, with its population literally starving last year, Zambia rejected 23,000 metric tons of U.S. food aid because Europe might reject future Zambian corn exports. EU pressure is even impeding research on new transgenic crop varieties important to bringing Africa closer to sustainability.

The Speaker of the House, USAID Administrator, and leading scientists will testify at my Research Subcommittee hearing this Thursday. We will examine barriers to plant biotechnology in Africa and new government programs supporting partnerships with African scientists in Africa.

The U.S. challenge moves us one step closer to removing unfair barriers that hurt American farmers and deny the people of Africa a tool for combating hunger. Please support H. Res. 252.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and with 1 minute, I will have to be brief. This really is not about biotech. It is about whether global agriculture trade will be conducted under the rules adopted by the countries pursuant to trade agreements.

There is a procedure for evaluating the safety and soundness of agriculture products to be exported into a marketplace. Under the WTO, it requires that measures regulating imports be based on sufficient scientific evidence and that countries operate regulatory approval and procedures without undue delay. Basically, the Europeans have thrown up this effort to keep our product out, and they have not followed the WTO actions in so pursuing this course of action.

That is why the resolution before us commanding our President is exactly the right thing to do. We can only participate as a full partner with other nations in trade agreements if people follow the rules. We have rules. The rules are being ignored to keep their markets closed to our exports. We need to pass this resolution.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share in the comments of the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and agree with him. Also, I would ask the Members that are thinking of voting against this, this boils down to be really kind of a moral issue of famine in Africa. I learned about this issue from our former Member, Congressman Tony Hall.

What is happening in Africa, there are 35 million to 40 million people that are basically almost starving to death. In Zambia and Zimbabwe, they have been using this argument, and the people are starving and the genetically modified or biotech foods are in the warehouses. What is taking place is some of our friends, and they are friends in Europe, are using this as a trade mechanism with regard to their economy and their jobs; and as a result of this, people are dying in Africa.

So this is an issue with regard to the economy, but I will not say more important; but I personally believe it is more important. It is an issue of people, particularly in Africa. People living in Ethiopia, there is a famine of biblical proportions. Now, fortunately, the Ethiopian Government is not foreclosing this; but in Zambia they are, in Zimbabwe, Mugabe has it in the warehouses and the people are starving outside, and they cannot eat. Some of the other countries, Uganda is going through the same thing. They have genetically modified banana plants. Their banana industry is falling off, and they are afraid to use it because they are afraid they will not be able to have their exports going in to France.

So this resolution is a good resolution. This also would help us feed the people of the world who are starving. So I would hope everyone would vote for this. And if any Members have any doubts before this vote, they may want to call Tony up in Rome at the Food and Agricultural Organization and get his thinking, because this is a major issue of famine and feeding hungry people, particularly in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 252, but not because of the benefits to U.S. trade or our agricultural industry, but out of concern for the millions of hungry people around the globe. In a world as plentiful as ours, it is unconscionable that women and children still die of hunger.

I have traveled to Africa to witness the devastation of famines, first in 1984 and most recently, earlier this year. I saw women and children who were too weak to feed themselves. Thankfully, relief efforts for the 30 million Africans, whose lives are in peril, are not being complicated by refusals of certain food supplies, as was the case last year in Zambia.

Developing countries need biotechnology to improve crop viability and yield. However, as long as such agricultural products remain unacceptable to European markets, developing countries are likely to continue to reject the very thing they need to bring them to self-sufficiency and beyond.

American agricultural products are among the safest in the world—even Europe's officials admit that. But making a convincing case on the safety of U.S. products is difficult.

Last year, Zambians turned down genetically modified maize from the U.S., fearing that when their agricultural industry recovers, they would no longer be able to sell their products to their main export market, Europe.

In an effort to alleviate this concern, and at considerably increased costs, the U.S. offered a milled version free from any seeds that farmers could plant, thereby protecting Zambia's agricultural sector. Tragically, the Zambian government never accepted the food.

Famine relief and building longer term self-sufficiency in Africa is a global issue that requires a response from all nations. The U.S. has provided leadership through its contribution in 2002 of 51 percent of the food provided by the UN World Food Programme. Europe's combined contribution totaled only 27 percent.

I don't know which saddens me more, knowing that European countries like France have the ability to contribute more to famine relief efforts, but haven't, or knowing the situation is being exacerbated by European opposition to importing biotech agricultural products.

This resolution is an important statement to encourage the Administration in its efforts to challenge the unwarranted moratorium by EU countries on genetically modified agricultural products.

I urge a unanimous vote of support.

Mr. KLEczKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 252 supporting the United States' effort to end the European Union's discriminatory trade practices regarding agriculture biotechnology.

Biotechnology is critically important for the future of U.S. agriculture, not

just the farmers in my district. Genetically enhanced crops have increased yields, decreased production inputs, and reduced pesticide usage. In the near future, this technology will allow U.S. farmers to produce healthier, fresher, and more nutritious food products for consumers.

Throughout its lifetime, agricultural biotechnology has been the subject of the strictest testing by USDA, FDA, and EPA prior to consumption, and has made considerable contributions to protection of the environment by reducing the application of pesticides.

However, amongst this growing climate for innovation, the European Union has continued to pursue a path of opposition. The EU moratorium has cost U.S. farmers almost \$300 million a year in corn exports alone and goes directly against the WTO mandate that the regulation of imports be based on "sufficient scientific evidence." As such, their policies have resulted in a slowdown of development and support of genetically engineered products around the world.

I believe that the EU's opposition to agriculture biotechnology has much more to do with the discriminatory trading practices that they employ, rather than environmental science. I applaud the work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Trade Representative to challenge the EU's moratorium on this technology, and I am happy to lend my support to this important resolution. I urge Members' "aye" votes.

Mr. KLEczKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution and to state my support and urge House support for the administration and its decision to take on the European Union and its discriminatory practices against biotech projects.

Agriculture has changed greatly in recent years. When I was growing up on a farm in Johnston County, the most advanced technology we had was an old tractor. It was a big improvement, though, over the mule and plow that we had had previously.

These days, biotechnology has moved farming to the cutting edge of technology. I have always been and still remain a strong supporter of using biotechnology to benefit American agriculture and our society as a whole. In fact, when I was appropriations chairman in North Carolina's general assembly, I helped fund the establishment of the North Carolina Biotechnology Center, because I could see biotechnology was the science of the future. Consequently, North Carolina has become a leader in the field of biotechnology.

The gains that biotechnology brings to agriculture, efficiency, reduced use

of pesticides, higher crop yields, and healthier products, are well documented. That is why I find it ironic that the continent that gave birth to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment is turning its back on a proven science, despite the increasing amount of evidence as to the safety and effectiveness of this technology.

What is really a shame is that the Europeans' fear of biotechnology is having tragic consequences. The European Union is actually discouraging nations facing food shortages and famine from accepting food aid that may contain biotech products.

The Europeans' actions and attitude regarding biotechnology are, at best, indefensible, and maybe immoral regarding the European Union's rule. I strongly applaud Ambassador Zoellick's work in this area, and I urge the passage of this resolution.

I rise today in support of this resolution to state the House's support for the Administration in its decision to take on the European Union and its discriminatory practices against U.S. biotechnology products.

Agriculture has changed greatly in recent years. When I was growing up on a farm in Johnston County, NC, the most advanced technology we had was a tractor, a big improvement over a plow, a mule. These days, biotechnology has moved farming to the cutting edge of technology.

I have always been and still remain a strong supporter of using biotechnology to benefit American agriculture and our society as a whole.

In fact, when I was appropriations chairman in the North Carolina General Assembly, I helped fund the establishment of the North Carolina Biotechnology Center because I could see biotech was a science of the future. Consequently, my State of North Carolina has prospered as a leader in the field.

The gains that biotechnology brings to agriculture in efficiency, reduced use of pesticides, higher crop yields, and healthier products are well documented.

That's why I find it ironic that the continent that gave birth to The Renaissance and The Enlightenment is turning its back on a proven science, despite the increasing amount of evidence as to the safety and effectiveness of this technology.

And what's really a shame is that the Europeans' fear of biotechnology is having tragic consequences. The European Union is actually discouraging nations facing food shortages and famine from accepting U.S. food aid that may contain biotechnology products.

The Europeans' actions and attitudes regarding biotechnology are indefensible, and according to WTO rules, illegal.

I strongly applaud USTR Ambassador Zoellick for pressing forward with this case against the European Union in the WTO.

We must continue to show the world that biotechnology offers a new Renaissance in agriculture for those willing to reject fear.

I urge the House to pass this resolution, and show our support for a science that offers profound benefits for all of humanity.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, obviously, biotech is really important to

the Midwest. Roughly 55 percent of the corn grown in Nebraska and a high percentage of the beans grown in Nebraska are biotech, and roughly \$300 million in corn exports is being blocked by the current boycott.

As has been mentioned by several speakers previously, this boycott is not about safety. It is a tariff, and it is a thinly disguised tariff. The European Union did the same thing in blocking our beef that was fed hormones. The WTO stepped in and said, look, that is nonsense. This is against WTO rules, so it is something that has precedent. So the European Union has simply said, well, we will go ahead and pay the fine; it saves us the money. We will pay \$116 million a year in blocking your beef, and that is essentially what this tariff is doing as well.

Already, people have mentioned several times about the fact that starving people, particularly people in Africa, have had their products blocked; and this is, I think, unconscionable.

Lastly, let me just say in regard to the reduction of pesticides, water use, fertilizer, these are certainly good for the environment. And we hear people all around the country decrying biotech; and yet Brazil, when we were down there a year ago, said they really did not believe in biotech, and yet they are raising 1 million acres of soybeans. So they obviously know it is safe. So usually these are simply tariff barriers. I certainly applaud the resolution, and I urge support of it. It makes a lot of sense.

Mr. KLECKZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252. I feel compelled to remind all 280 million Americans once again that we are truly blessed in this country to have the most abundant food supply, the best quality of food, the safest food supply at the lowest cost to our people of any country in the world. That has not happened by accident. It has always happened because we have always used sound science, peer-reviewed, in order to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before.

Now, we have repeatedly heard even today the explanation that the European Union maintains its ban on new approvals of biotech products because European consumers are unwilling to accept biotechnology due to safety concerns. That explanation disappoints me.

There are no peer-reviewed, scientific risk assessments that conclude that food products of agriculture biotechnology are inherently less safe than their traditional counterparts. Bio-engineered crops in the United States are rigorously reviewed for environmental and food safety by USDA, EPA, and FDA. Food safety reviews of bio-engineered crops focus on the safe-

ty of the newly introduced trait, on the safety of the whole food, and consider issues including toxicity, allergenicity, nutritional content, and antibiotic resistance.

Our forward-looking regulatory system has not only ensured the safety of our food supply, it has allowed the development of technologies that have improved our food supply and lowered the cost of production. Besides lowering costs, biotechnology has the potential to reduce crop risks and improve food security in developing countries, as we heard the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) speak about a moment ago. Examples include US-AID projects in Africa to improve production of peas and bananas.

Regulations based on protectionism instead of science have a chilling effect on research and the adoption of biotechnology. When there is uncertainty that a product of biotechnology will be accepted, farmers are reluctant to adopt the product, despite its proven safety and benefits.

I believe that the US and the EU have a responsibility as developed nations to lead by example in developing regulatory systems that not only promote safe food, but also promote a better and more secure food supply.

And I am disappointed that Europe has so far been unable to construct a science-based regulatory system for food that encourage development of new technologies that can benefit developed and developing countries around the world.

The resolution before us today supports our requests for consultations with Europe on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1330

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution and I hope all of the Members of the House will support it. Earlier this year, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I had the opportunity to meet with Pascal Lamy, the European Union Commissioner for Trade, and to strongly make the case that this moratorium that Europe has imposed upon U.S. biotech products should be dropped and a reasonable system should be administered in its place; not what they are currently contemplating, which is a tracking and labeling requirement, which will make it in some instances even harder for us to sell our products into Europe.

I pointed out to them that people have been starving in Africa because of their policies. He took great umbrage at my suggestion that the Europeans were in fact promoting such a policy in Africa, but it turns out that that is exactly the case.

Through the organizations that they hire to distribute their own European food aid in African countries, they have spread the word that if they feed U.S. biotech grapes to their livestock, they will not be able to sell that livestock into Europe. It turns out that the Spanish, who agree with us on this position, by the way, grow thousands and thousands of acres of biotech crops in Spain, feed it to livestock, and sell it all over Europe anyway.

So the European policy on this issue is clearly nothing more than an artificial trade barrier. It is against the interests of their people, their consumers, to have the opportunity to have greater quality foods, foods that have greater vitamin retention, foods that are more environmentally sound, foods that can be grown in places like sub-Saharan African that are more drought-resistant. All of these things are important for us to promote, and that is what biotechnology does.

I commend the Bush administration for taking this case to the World Trade Organization, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 252. America's farmers and ranchers deserve to have the best technologies available at their disposal and I am hopeful that an end to the EU's illegal and long-standing moratorium on agricultural biotechnology may be near.

Agricultural biotechnology is one of the most promising developments in modern science. This science should be embraced and not banned, for it can help to provide answers to the problems of hunger around the world. It would be a shame if developing countries in Africa continue to deny food aid containing biotechnology because of the antibiotechnology attitudes in Europe. The politicizing of agricultural biotechnology should end so that we can return to providing food aid to the hungry as soon as possible.

I commend the Bush administration for taking this case to the World Trade Organization. The EU moratorium on biotech approvals has been spreading beyond Europe. In the fall of 2002, some famine stricken African nations refused U.S. food aid because it contained biotech corn. These countries were ill informed on the health and environmental impact of biotechnology and were also concerned that their own agriculture exports to Europe would be denied if they accepted the product. Zambia, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe refused United States food aid made of the same wholesome food that Americans eat every day. Zimbabwe and Mozambique eventually accepted United States food aid after making costly arrangements to mill the corn so that African farmers could not grow it. Zambia continues to refuse United States corn.

As noted by the French Academy of Sciences, more than 300 million North Americans have been eating biotech corn and soybeans for years. No adverse health consequences have ever been reported. Many biotechnology products are being developed that will have unlimited benefits to vitamin deficient children. Research continues on a gene to add to rice which will contain more beta carotene, a precursor to vitamin A. Up to half of a million children per year go blind due to

vitamin A deficiency. Another product being developed could also help reduce iron deficiencies, thus reducing anemia among millions of women and children worldwide.

The United States is not trying to force consumers to buy these biotechnology products. Consumer choice is the key and the moratorium is an example of the European government denying their consumers a choice. The moratorium is not based on science, but it is a blatant protectionist trade barrier. American farmers and ranchers are merely asking that their safe, sound and affordable product be allowed on the shelves in Europe.

America's farmers and ranchers produce the safest and most bountiful food supply in the world. Their goal is to share this bounty with those who need it most, while at the same time having access to markets around the world. While United States farmers have utilized many of the new technologies, some farmers are hesitant to use biotechnology because of the moratorium in Europe.

The European Union's (EU) illegal and unscientific moratorium should be lifted and a WTO case against the EU will send a message to the rest of the world that illegitimate, non-science based trade barriers will not be tolerated.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 252.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would also like to thank the leadership of a colleague of mine, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who has been tremendous on this issue.

I do not know why we are telling the World Trade Organization what to do because they do not listen to us anyway. We tried to inform them and advise them on steel tariffs and they did not listen to us. We are not against trade. We understand there is going to be trade. There has always been trade, there always will be trade.

What we are against is shifting the debate from this Chamber, shifting the debate from the Parliament, shifting the debate from the Russian Duma to a bureaucratic organization behind closed doors with no accountability. They are not elected by anybody on the face of this Earth, they are appointed, and they represent the corporate interests. That is the problem.

We are losing our sovereignty in this country, and if we tell the European Union or if we tell another country what they need to do, at what point do they tell us what we need to do? When is it our labor laws, our environmental laws that become exposed?

I think that is the thing that we need to be most focused on is that we are losing our sovereignty. We want strong environmental laws in this country, we want strong labor laws in this country, and the World Trade Organization has proven and consistently tried to undermine those things. We need to fix the system and we need to let the WTO be O-U-T.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chairman of the House Biotechnology Caucus in strong support of House Resolution 252. Approvals for biotech commodities are critical to the future of biotechnology. By filing a complaint with the WTO, the administration has taken the necessary steps to respond to the European Union's moratorium on biotech food products.

The EU moratorium is a clear violation of Europe's WTO obligations. The policy has cost American farmers hundreds of millions of dollars in export sales and seriously hindered the adoption of an enormously beneficial technology. Moreover, the hysteria brought on by the EU policies has begun to spread beyond European borders. It was time to act.

Specifically, the European Union represents a \$1 billion per year market for U.S. soybeans and their products, a \$500 million market for U.S. corn gluten feed, and a former \$300 million per year market for the U.S. commodity corn.

The U.S. lost its commodity corn export business to the European Union in recent years over issues related to the acceptance of biotechnology-enhanced products.

As the U.S. already exports more than one-third of its agricultural production and farm States such as Illinois export more than 40 percent of their agricultural products, it is essential that the EU model for food safety and precaution is stopped before their policy and attitudes towards biotechnology affect U.S. export markets around the world.

Recently, several Illinois farmers returning from Europe concluded that the U.S. needs to take the EU to the WTO over the current EU moratorium on biotech crops.

I commend the administration for their leadership in taking the necessary steps to end this ridiculous moratorium, and urge my colleagues to support this resolution and send a strong signal to the EU and the rest of the world that the U.S. will not tolerate illegitimate, unscientific barriers to U.S. agricultural exports.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of sovereignty. The democratically elected governments of Europe have chosen, with tremendous support and urging by their own people, to urge more study and delay on the massive introduction of genetically modified organisms into their agricultural system. A large majority of Americans would like to see the same testing.

We heard about testing, that this is regulated by the FDA. No, it is not. It is not regulated by the FDA. They said

they have no jurisdiction, and it has been tested by the EPA. No, these things have not been tested by the EPA. It has been tested by the industry, who tells us, do not worry, it is safe. So the peer review tests we heard about and the government regulation that we heard about do not exist for the American people, and certainly not for the European people.

So are we going to turn to this faceless, conflict-ridden bureaucracy, the WTO, and ask it to preempt the laws of the sovereign nations of Europe? Then how about next week, when someone asks it to preempt some of our consumer health and safety or labor or environmental laws? That will happen, we can bet on it.

We heard a lot about Africa. Well, they will accept the food aid if the seed corn is ground up or the wheat is milled. They will take it. They are happy to take it. They just do not want the starving people there to take it out and plant it and begin to have it cross with their traditional crops. So that is not too tough of a thing to accomplish.

There are huge problems in the distribution system, these massively corrupt dictatorships. People of Africa are not being starved because the Europeans have chosen to protect their people and their agriculture against unknown, untested science, unregulated. That is not a true fact.

Let us have the debate about what this is about, which is new corporate interests that want to increase profits. Most of this is about increasing profits. Tell the people in India who have to buy patented seed year after year, or the people in Canada who have been prosecuted because they tried to replant the seed or it crossed into their crops and they have been prosecuted by Montana, that this is about making the world safe for people to not starve, and for the environment and all those things. No, it is, pure and simple, about profits for American industry.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues at stake here, including one that has been mentioned by my colleagues, the gentlemen from Ohio, Mr. BROWN and Mr. RYAN, with respect to the WTO and the fact that it strips all nations of sovereignty. That is an issue that this House inevitably will have to deal with when, at once, legislation should come before us to in effect cancel our relationship with the WTO.

Now, House Resolution 252 falsely argues for a solution to world hunger, but its prime motive is to garner bigger profits for biotech companies looking to dump GE foods on poor countries. This is really about hungry biotech companies, because the basic cause of hunger is money, not food. The facts of

world hunger lead to a much different conclusion.

Currently, 800 million go hungry every day. Malnutrition and related illnesses are the cause of death for 12 million children each year, but a lack of food is not the reason. Enough wheat, rice, and other grains are produced each year to provide 3,500 daily calories per person. So why do so many people go hungry each day? Much of this food goes to those who have the money and the ability to transport it. Food and other farm products flow from areas of hunger and need to areas where money is concentrated, in the northern hemisphere.

While at least 200 million Indians go hungry, in 1995 India exported \$625 million worth of wheat and flour and \$1.3 billion worth of rice, the two staples of the Indian diet. Only one-quarter of the food produced in Ethiopia reaches the market because of the high cost of marketing transactions.

There are hungry kids in this country, Mr. Speaker. What has biotech done for them?

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a summary of a report we wrote on biotechnology in the Committee on Science called "Seeds of Opportunity." The total report is available at: www.house.gov/nicksmith/opportunity.pdf.

The report referred to is as follows:

SUMMARY

The Subcommittee on Basic Research of the Committee on Science held a series of three hearings entitled, "Plant Genome Research: From the Lab to the Field to the Market: Parts I-III," to examine plant genomics, its application to commercially important crop plants, and the benefits, safety, and oversight of plant varieties produced using biotechnology. The testimony and other information presented at these hearings and information gathered at various briefings provides the basis for the findings and recommendations in this report.

Almost without exception, the crop plants in use today have been genetically modified. The development of new plant varieties through selective breeding has been improving agriculture and food production for thousands of years. In the 19th century, the basic principles of heredity were discovered by Gregor Mendel, whose studies on inheritance in garden peas laid the foundation for the modern science of genetics. Subsequent investigations advanced our understanding of the location, composition, and function of genes, and a critical breakthrough revolutionized the field in 1953, when James Watson and Francis Crick described the double helix structure of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), the substance of heredity. This ground breaking research set the stage for deciphering the genetic code and led to the rapid advances in practical application of genetics in medicine, animal science, and agriculture.

The development of the science of genetics in the 20th century was a tremendously important factor in the plant breeding programs that have produced the remarkable diversity of fruits, vegetables, and grains that we enjoy today and that provide food security for the poor nations of the world. Traditional crossbreeding has been very useful in improving crop plants, but it is a time consuming process that results in the uncontrolled recombination of tens of thousands of genes, commonly producing unwanted traits that must be eliminated through successive rounds of backcrossing. Improving crops through traditional methods also is subject to severe limitations because of the constraints imposed by sexual compatibility, which limit the diversity of useful genetic material.

With the arrival of biotechnology, plant breeders are now able to develop novel varieties of plants with a level of precision and range unheard of just two decades ago. Using this technology, breeders can introduce selected, useful genes into a plant to express a specific, desirable trait in a significantly more controlled process than afforded by traditional breeding methods.

U.S. farmers have been quick to adopt plants modified using new biotechnology, including commercial crops that resist biologically insect and viral pests and tolerate broad-spectrum herbicides used to control weeds. As our knowledge of plant genetics expands, new varieties of plants with improved nutrition, taste, or other characteristics desired by consumers will become available. The federally-funded plant genome program provides much of the essential basic research on plant genetics required to develop new varieties of commercially important crops through advanced breeding programs.

For over two decades, the application of biotechnology has been assessed for safety. Oversight of agricultural biotechnology includes both regulatory and nonregulatory mechanisms that have been developed over the last five decades for all crop plants and conventional agricultural systems. Federal regulation of agricultural biotechnology is guided by the 1986 Coordinated Framework for Regulation of Biotechnology, which laid out the responsibilities for the different regulatory agencies, and the 1992 Statement on Scope, which established the principle that regulation should focus on the characteristics of the organism, not the method used to produce it. Three federal agencies are responsible for regulating agricultural biotechnology under existing statutes: the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), which is responsible for ensuring that new varieties are safe to grow; the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which is responsible for ensuring that new pest-resistant varieties are safe to grow and consume; and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), which is responsible for ensuring that new varieties are safe to consume.

Although biotechnology has had an uninterrupted record of safe use, political activists in Europe have waged well-funded campaigns to persuade the public that the products of high-tech agriculture may be harmful to human health and the environment. As a result of these efforts, public confidence in the safety of agricultural biotechnology has been seriously undermined in Europe. Many European countries have established new rules and procedures specifically designed to address "genetically modified organisms," and these have

had a detrimental impact on international trade in agricultural products.

The controversy over agricultural biotechnology now has spread to the United States, the world's largest grower of plants and consumer of foods produced using this technology. At the core of the debate is food safety, particularly the possibility that unexpected genetic effects could introduce allergens or toxins into the food supply. The use of antibiotic resistance markers also has been criticized as dangerous to human health. As a result, there have been calls for both increased testing and labeling requirements for foods created using biotechnology.

Environmental concerns also have been raised. It has been suggested, for example, that widespread use of plants engineered with built-in protection against insect and viral pests could accelerate the development of pesticide-resistant insects or could have a negative impact on populations of beneficial insects, such as the Monarch butterfly. It also has been argued that the use of herbicide-tolerant plants could increase herbicide use and that "superweeds" could be developed through cross-pollination between these plants and nearby weedy relatives.

Extensive scientific evaluation worldwide has produced no evidence to support these claims. Far from causing environmental and health problems, agricultural biotechnology has tremendous potential to reduce the environmental impact of farming, provide better nutrition, and help feed a rapidly growing world population. Crops designed to resist pests and to tolerate herbicides and environmental stresses, such as freezing temperatures, drought, and high salinity, will make agriculture more efficient and sustainable by reducing synthetic chemical inputs and promoting no-till agricultural practices. Stress-tolerant crops also will reduce pressure on irreplaceable natural resources like rainforests by opening up presently nonarable lands to agriculture. Other plants are being developed that will produce renewable industrial products, such as lubricating oils and biodegradable plastics, and perform bioremediation of contaminated soils.

Biotechnology will be a key element in the fight against malnutrition worldwide. Deficiencies of vitamin A and iron, for example, are very serious health issues in many regions of the developing world, causing childhood blindness and maternal anemia in millions of people who rely on rice as a dietary staple. Biotechnology has been used to produce a new strain of rice—Golden Rice—that contains both vitamin A (by providing its precursor, beta-carotene) and iron. The Subcommittee heard about other research aimed at improving the nutrition of a wide variety of food staples, such as cassava, corn, rice, and other cereal grains, that can be a significant help in the fight for food security in many developing countries.

The merging of medical and agricultural biotechnology has opened up new ways to develop plant varieties with characteristics to enhance health. Advanced understanding of how natural plant substances, known as phytochemicals, confer protection against cancer and other diseases is being used to enhance the level of these substances in the food supply. Work is underway that will deliver medicines and edible vaccines through common foods that could be used to immunize in-

dividuals against a wide variety of enteric and other infectious diseases. These developments will have far-reaching implications for improving human health worldwide, potentially saving millions of lives in the poorest areas of the world by providing a simpler medicine production and distribution system.

Set against these benefits, however, is the idea that transferring a gene from one organism to an unrelated organism using recombinant DNA techniques inherently entails greater risks than traditional cross breeding. The weight of the scientific evidence leads to the conclusion that there is nothing to substantiate scientifically the view that the products of agricultural biotechnology are inherently different or more risky than similar products of conventional breeding.

The overwhelming view of the scientific community—including the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, many professional scientific societies, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the World Health Organization, and the research scientists who appeared before the subcommittee—is that risk assessment should focus on the characteristics of the plant and the environment into which it is to be introduced, not on the method of genetic manipulation and the source of the genetic material transferred. These risk factors apply equally to traditionally-bred plants.

Years of research and experience demonstrate that plant varieties produced using biotechnology, and the foods derived from them, are just as safe as similar varieties produced using classical plant breeding, and they may even be safer. Because more is known about the changes being made and because common crop varieties with which we have a broad range of experience are being modified, plant breeders can answer questions about safety that cannot be answered for the products of classical breeding techniques.

FDA has adopted a risk-based regulatory approach consistent with these principles and with the long history of safe use of genetically-modified plants and the foods derived from them. Its policies on voluntary consultation and labeling are consistent with the scientific consensus and provide essential public health protection.

Unlike FDA regulations on food, USDA has instituted plant pest regulations, and EPA proposes to institute new plant pesticide regulations, that target selectively plants produced using biotechnology and apply substantive regulatory requirements to early stages of plant research and development. These regulations add greatly to the cost of developing new biotech plant varieties, harming both an emerging industry and the largely publicly-funded research base upon which it depends. Regulations and regulatory proposals that selectively capture the products of biotechnology should be modified to reflect the scientific consensus that the source of the gene and the methods used to transfer it are poor indicators of risk.

In the international area, the United States should work to ensure that access to existing markets for agricultural products are maintained. The United States should not accept any international agreements that endorse the precautionary principle—which asserts that governments may make political decisions to restrict a product even in the absence of scientific evidence that a risk exists—and that

depart from the principle of substantial equivalence adopted by a number of international bodies.

Finally, the administration, industry, and scientific community have a responsibility to educate the public and improve the availability of information on the long record of safe use of agricultural biotechnology products. This is critically important to building consumer confidence and ensuring that sound science is used to make regulatory decisions.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

When I first came to this Congress, I was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture. It makes all kinds of sense. The district I represent in California produces about \$4 billion value-added from agriculture. I have been dealing with this issue for more than a quarter of a century.

What we just heard was a total fabrication of reality. We have heard about the green revolution, the attempt to feed more people in the world. In the old days, they used to take a plant, put a slit in it, and graft another portion of the plant onto it. That was science in those days.

There is fundamentally no difference to what we now call biotechnology than understanding the way the world works, and through science improving our ability to produce food to feed people. Everything else is politics. Somehow, large corporations get involved, the desire to sell something to Africa that Africa does not want.

I was in Africa 3 months ago. They pleaded with us to help them solve their problem. The problem is the Luddites in the world today who do not want to recognize science. Anybody who assists the Europeans in their unscientific opposition to wanting to do better with the amount we have is simply attempting to wreak havoc.

Vote for science. Vote yes.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution supporting the Administration's efforts in challenging the European Union's five-year moratorium on biotech products. As an original cosponsor, I congratulate President Bush and Ambassador Zoellick for putting American farmers and sound science first by challenging this illegal trade ban on genetically modified foods before the WTO.

Over the last few years, we have seen country after country implementing protectionist trade policies, like the EU moratorium, under the cloak of food safety—each one brought on by emotion, culture, or their own poor history with food safety regulation.

Simply put, non-tariff protectionism is detrimental to the free movement of goods and services across borders. We all know that free trade benefits all countries. However, free trade will be rendered meaningless if it is short-circuited by non-tariff barriers that are based on fear and conjecture—not science.

As the Representative of the 14th District in Illinois, my district currently covers portions of eight countries, including four of the top 25 corn-producing counties, and three of the top 50 soybean-producing counties in the nation. The State of Illinois is the second-largest producing state of both corn and soybeans in the country. Forty percent of this production currently goes to exports, valued at approximately \$2.7 billion per year.

U.S. agriculture ranks among the top U.S. industries in export sales. In fact, the industry generated a \$12 billion trade surplus in 2001, helping mitigate the growing merchandise trade deficit. It is important to realize that 34 percent of all corn acres and 75 percent of all soybean acres are genetically modified.

And what exactly are we talking about when we say "genetically modified?" The EU would have you believe this is a new and special type of food, questionable for human consumption. In fact, since the dawn of time, farmers have been modifying plants to improve yields and create new varieties resistant to pests and diseases. Why would we want to snuff out human ingenuity that benefits farmers and consumers alike?

The European Union has had an indefensible moratorium on genetically-modified products in place for five years with no end in sight. This is a non-tariff barrier based simply on prejudice and misinformation, not sound science. In fact, their own scientists agree that genetically modified foods are safe. Still, regardless of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, bans on genetically modified products continue to persist and multiply—the worldwide impact has been staggering.

The current EU moratorium on genetically-modified products has translated into an annual loss of over \$300 million in corn exports for U.S. farmers. More disturbing is the recent trend in Africa, where several nations have rejected U.S. food aid because the shipments contained biotech corn. This based solely on the fear that EU countries will not accept their food exports if genetically modified seeds spread to domestic crops.

These actions by our trading partners have consequences. U.S. farmers are already beginning to plant more non-biotech seeds. This trend will increase farmers' cost of production as well as increase the damage from harmful insects. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has recently approved a corn technology that will allow the commercialization of the first corn designed to control rootworm—a pest that costs U.S. farmers approximately \$1 billion in lost revenue per year. It is absurd to think that farmers would not be able to take advantage of this technology.

Clearly, the long-term impact of these policies could be disastrous for U.S. farmers in terms of competitiveness and the ability to provide food for the world's population. Addressing world hunger is particularly critical when approximately 800 million people are malnourished in the developing world, and another 100 million go hungry each day. Biotechnology is the answer to this pressing problem. Farmers can produce better yields through drought-tolerant varieties, which are rich in nutrients and more resistant to insects and weeds, while those in need reap the benefits.

As you can see, halting or even slowing down the development of this technology could have dire consequences for countries

where populations are growing rapidly and all arable land is already under cultivation. Official WTO action will send a clear and convincing message to the world that prohibitive policies on biotechnology which are not based on sound science are illegal.

Hopefully, the WTO will act quickly to resolve the Administration's case on behalf of American farmers. There's no doubt that the U.S. and American agriculture go into this battle with the facts on our side. We simply cannot allow the free trade of our agriculture products to be restricted by this unfair and unjust moratorium. After all, the price of inaction is one we can no longer afford to pay.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure not because I wish to either support or oppose genetically-modified products. Clearly the production and consumption of these products is a matter for producers and consumers to decide for themselves.

I oppose this bill because at its core it is government intervention—both in our own markets and in the affairs of foreign independent nations. Whether European governments decide to purchase American products should not be a matter for the U.S. Congress to decide. It is a matter for European governments and the citizens of European Union member countries. While it may be true that the European Union acts irrationally in blocking the import of genetically-modified products, the matter is one for European citizens to decide.

Also, this legislation praises U.S. efforts to use the World Trade Organization to force open European markets to genetically-modified products. The WTO is an unelected world bureaucracy seeking to undermine the sovereignty of nations and peoples. It has nothing to do with free trade and everything to do with government- and bureaucrat-managed trade. Just as it is unacceptable when the WTO demands—at the behest of foreign governments—that the United States government raise taxes and otherwise alter the practices of American private enterprise, it is likewise unacceptable when the WTO makes such demands to others on behalf of the United States. This is not free trade.

Genetically-modified agriculture products may well be the wave of the future. They may provide food for the world's populations and contribute to the eradication of disease. That is something we certainly hope for and for which we will all applaud should it prove to be the case. But, again, this legislation is not about that. That is why I must oppose this bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in qualified support of this measure.

I am a proponent of genetically modified (GM) food, and firmly believe that its continued implementation and use provides a number of important benefits for the American farmer and worldwide consumers. Furthermore, I believe we are legally correct and justified in asking the World Trade Organization (WTO) to impose penalties on the EU for maintaining a moratorium on import permits for genetically modified crops in violation of its rules.

However, I fear that our government's efforts will have the unintended consequence of wreaking havoc on the current WTO trade discussions. As we all know, the U.S. farmer would benefit much more if, in the current Doha

Round of the WTO, the EU nations agreed to slash the generous agriculture subsidy assistance they provide their farmers.

According to a recent Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an international organization that seeks to help governments tackle the economic, social, and governance challenges of a globalized economy, in 2002, the EU provided \$112.6 billion in agricultural subsidies to their farmers. This amount totals approximately 1.3 percent of the EU GDP. Compare this staggering number with that of the United States, which generously provided in 2002 \$90.3 billion (0.9 percent of our GDP) to farmers in the form of agricultural subsidies, and you can easily see why reform of domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization is much needed.

In addition to fighting this important fight on GM foods today, the Administration and Congress need to hold the Europeans' feet to the fire on reforming their domestic agriculture policy and making their country more open to imported goods. The Doha Round was devised to accomplish these two objectives.

Moreover, the U.S.'s policy on GM foods must not just single out Europe. In an article, which appeared in yesterday's The Wall Street Journal, many U.S. soybean traders are accusing the Chinese of impeding soybean imports due to the failure of various inspection permits. The article continues by stating, "China last week announced it will extend to April 20, 2004, strict regulations on crops containing genetically modified organisms that had been set to expire September 20th."

Thus, the question that needs to be asked—Is China moving toward closing its borders in perpetuity on import permits for genetically modified crops? Will the U.S. government file a similar petition against the Chinese government? If so, when? If not, why not? After all, under commitments China made when it became a member of the WTO in December 2001, it must open its market to agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do likewise—but I suggest more substantive work be done to reform domestic agricultural policy and worldwide agricultural trade liberalization policies that currently stand in the way of sustainability and prosperity of our farmers.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 252. This important resolution expresses the House of Representatives' supports for American efforts within the World Trade Organization (WTO) to end the European Union's unfair trade practices regarding agriculture biotechnology. These trade practices are protectionist and discriminatory, and have been in place the past five years.

In 2001, the United States and other industrialized countries produced almost 109 million acres of genetically modified foods. These foods are modified, safely, to reduce the application of pesticides, reduce soil erosion and

create an environment more hospitable to wildlife. These foods are resilient and can grow in areas often inhospitable to agriculture. Genetically modified foods hold great promise in alleviating hunger in developing areas of the world.

The European Union, acting without scientific basis, enacted a moratorium on genetically modified foods in October 1998. Since then, this moratorium has blocked more than \$300 million annually in American corn exports to countries in the European Union. This action has had a damaging effect on agricultural exports from the United States, particularly from Iowa.

Allow me to describe the devastating effect this action has had on many developing countries in Africa. Earlier this year, I traveled to several nations in sub-Saharan Africa. I met people trying to help themselves with their own hard work, and through the humanitarian efforts of the United States and other nations. Far too many people in Africa depend on food from other countries, and far too many are starving. Genetically modified food could withstand the intolerant climate and harsh growing landscapes common in the area. But because of fear about future exports to Europe, these African nations have held back from a wonderful opportunity to promote agriculture in their own nations. Just last year, humanitarian food aid sent to Africa from the United States was rejected. Mr. Speaker, this is wrong.

Iowa is America's second-largest agriculture exporter, sending \$3.2 billion worth of commodities and value-added products overseas. There is much promise in using biotechnology to change the face of agriculture. Biotechnology is now being researched to create custom-made pharmaceuticals and renewable ingredients for industrial use. The cities of Waterloo and Davenport in my district are working to make value-added agriculture the driving force of their economic growth. They are making significant investments to reach this end. It is clear that continued research and production is needed to make these investments pay off for these communities and the rest of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, we took a tremendous step forward by granting the President trade promotion authority. As the U.S. begins to negotiate trade agreements with this authority, it is critical we demonstrate that protectionist and discriminatory practices, like those used by the EU, will not be tolerated. The U.S. must now take further action within the WTO. I applaud the President and the U.S. Trade Representative's interest in taking action on this critical issue now. Accordingly, I urge passage of this resolution supporting Administration efforts through the WTO.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I cautiously approach my colleagues' zealous concern about the European Union's long-standing moratorium on agriculture and biotech products. The World Trade Organization agreement does recognize that countries are entitled to regulate crops and food products to protect health and the environment. However, WTO members must have sufficient evidence for their regulations and must operate approval procedures without "undue delay." The EU's current moratorium lacks sufficient justification and at 5 years has reached a point of undue delay.

At the same time, consumers have a right to know what they are eating and the food indus-

try should remain transparent and accountable. I fully support labeling and a comprehensive paper trail that would ensure that consumers are aware when they are purchasing genetically modified ingredients.

I am more cautious than the Bush administration on this issue, but also feel the European Union's moratorium is extreme. I support this resolution in the spirit of fair trade, but urge my colleagues and the administration to not interfere with consumer awareness to be gained by labeling and industry transparency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 252, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING SCIENTIFIC SIGNIFICANCE OF SEQUENCING OF HUMAN GENOME AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR GOALS AND IDEALS OF HUMAN GENOME MONTH AND DNA DAY

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years and expressing support for the goals and ideals of Human Genome Month and DNA Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 110

Whereas April 25, 2003, will be the 50th anniversary of the publication of the description of the double-helix structure of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) in *Nature* magazine by James D. Watson and Francis H.C. Crick, which is considered by many scientists to be one of the most significant scientific discoveries of the twentieth century;

Whereas their discovery launched a field of inquiry that explained how DNA carries biological information in the genetic code and how this information is duplicated and passed from generation to generation, forming the stream of life that connects us all to our ancestors and to our descendants;

Whereas this field of inquiry in turn was crucial to the founding and continued growth of the field of biotechnology, which has led to historic scientific and economic advances for the world, advances in which the people of the United States have played a leading role and from which they have realized significant benefits;

Whereas, in April 2003, the international Human Genome Project will achieve essential completion of the finished reference sequence of the human genome, which carries all the biological information needed to construct the human form;

Whereas the Human Genome Project will be completed ahead of schedule and under budget;

Whereas all data from the Human Genome Project is provided free of charge to the public as soon as it is available;

Whereas the sequencing of the human genome has already fostered biomedical research discoveries that have led to improvements in human health;

Whereas the Human Genome Project has provided an exemplary model for social responsibility in scientific research, by devoting significant resources to studying the ethical, legal, and social implications of the project;

Whereas, in April 2003, the National Human Genome Research Institute of the National Institutes of Health will publish a new plan for genomic research;

Whereas this new plan will establish priorities for the future of genomic research, predict future developments in understanding heredity, and serve as a guide in applying this knowledge to improve human health; and

Whereas the National Human Genome Research Institute has designated April 2003 as "Human Genome Month" in celebration of the completion of the sequencing of the human genome and April 25, 2003, as "DNA Day" in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the publication of the description of the structure of DNA on April 25, 1953: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past one hundred years;

(2) honors the 50th anniversary of the outstanding accomplishment of describing the structure of DNA, the essential completion of the sequencing of the human genome in April 2003, and the development a plan for the future of genomics;

(3) supports the goals and ideals of Human Genome Month and DNA Day; and

(4) encourages schools, museums, cultural organizations, and other educational institutions in the United States to recognize Human Genome Month and DNA Day with appropriate programs and activities centered on human genomics, using information and materials provided through the National Human Genome Research Institute and other sources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House concurrent resolution 110.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 110, a concurrent resolution recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years