



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1996

No. 90

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2977) "An Act to reauthorize alternative means of dispute resolution in the Federal administrative process, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. LEVIN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1136. An act to control and prevent commercial counterfeiting, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1488. An act to convert certain excepted service positions in the United States Fire Administration to competitive service positions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1579. An act to streamline and improve the effectiveness of chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Single Audit Act").

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

HEALTH INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized during morning business for 1 minute.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to report to my colleagues that we have a real opportunity in the next day or so to reach an agreement with the Clinton administration on guaranteed portability of health care, of health insurance with no preconditions. We are working very diligently in exactly the way we believe the House wants us to, to make sure that every working American who is in the insurance system will have a guarantee that if they change jobs, they can automatically get insurance without any preconditions for the rest of their life, so it will eliminate the major concern of working Americans.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have a program which will extend a lower cost health care option, health insurance option, to the self-employed and small businesses. Most of the people who do not have health insurance, who are working, are either self-employed or work in small businesses. So if we can find a solution to a lower cost health insurance option, we give more Americans the ability to buy health insurance at lower cost. So we have both greater access and greater affordability. We give greater affordability through medical savings accounts, which lower the after-tax cost of buying insurance, and we get greater access by providing portability without any preconditions.

I hope we are on the verge of a real breakthrough to get this agreed to. We have already gone to conference. The Senate Republicans are prepared to go to conference immediately, if we can simply get an agreement, and we are working very diligently to get this

agreement. I wanted to report on that to my colleagues.

THE RATIONALE FOR VOTING FOR DENIAL OF MFN TRADE STATUS FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 President Clinton requested a special waiver to grant most-favored-nation trade status for China. Since the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989, I have worked with my colleagues to provide alternatives to denial of most-favored-nation status, including conditional renewal or targeting revocation. However, this year I will be voting to deny MFN to China and to deny the President's special request, because of the increased violations of our bilateral trade agreements, because of the increased repression in China and Tibet, and because of China's proliferation of weapons, chemical, nuclear, and advanced missile technology, to unsafeguarded countries including Pakistan and Iran.

Mr. Speaker, while I know there is not a large enough vote in the Congress to override a Presidential veto, and the President would veto a motion to deny MFN, I do believe that a vote to support the status quo in United States-China relations is difficult to defend for several reasons.

In the area of trade, China does not play by the rules. Despite the fact that over one-third of China's exports come into the United States and are sold in the United States markets, Chinese high-tariff and nontariff barriers limit access to the Chinese market for United States goods and services and hold our exports to only 2 percent of our exports into China—a third of China's exports allowed into the United States,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6425

only 2 percent of ours allowed into China.

On a strictly trade-by-trade basis, China does not reciprocate the trade benefits we grant to them under MFN status. The result is a \$34 billion United States trade deficit with China in 1995. As we can see from this chart, only 10 years ago we were reasonably in balance with a \$10 million trade deficit with China, and over the past 10 years the trade deficit has increased to just about \$34 billion.

Mr. Speaker, supporters of MFN will say that U.S. exports have tripled in the course of that time. They have, but Chinese exports to the United States have increased elevenfold, therefore resulting in this very extreme imbalance.

The deficit is expected to exceed \$41 billion in 1996, and does not include the economic loss of Chinese piracy of our intellectual property, which costs the United States economy over \$2.5 billion each year. It does not include the loss to our economy on Chinese insistence on offsets, production and technology transfer, which hurt American workers and rob our economic future, and it does not include money gained by China in the illegal smuggling of AK-47s and other weapons into the United States by the Chinese military.

Members will hear that trade with China is important for United States jobs. When President Clinton made his statement accompanying his request to renew MFN, he claimed new exports to China supported 170,000 American jobs. These jobs are very important. However, they must be seen in the larger context. Other trade relationships of comparable size, of, say, a \$56 billion trade relationship, produce many, many more jobs because our trade relationship is more in balance. More of our exports are allowed into other countries' markets.

Other trade relationships of comparable size to the China-United States trade relationship support at least twice as many jobs. For example, the United States-United Kingdom trade relationship totaling \$2 billion less than the United States-China relationship supports 432,000 jobs. The trade is less but the number of jobs is well over 2 times. The United States-South Korea relationship is \$8 billion less than the United States-China trade relationship. It supports 381,000 jobs, well over double the Chinese trade relationship. Why? Because of lack of market access for United States products into the Chinese marketplace.

We must also be concerned about the harm to our economy of the technology transfer and production transfer which is accompanying United States investment in China and United States sales to China. The Chinese Government demands that companies wishing to obtain access to the Chinese market not only build factories there, so that the products are made in China, not in the United States, but that they also transfer state-of-the-art technology to do so. The Government then takes that

technology, misappropriates it, the companies have little choice, because they want to access the market. We are helping the Chinese Government build our own competitors, using our state-of-the-art technology. Time does not permit me to go further, but more will come.

ENVIRONMENTAL ESTROGENS AND THEIR LINKS TO BREAST CANCER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, sadly, I am not surprised by an article in last Friday's Washington Post regarding yet another environmental health risk. The article discusses a new scientific study showing major health risk posed by chemicals commonly found in our environment. Despite even the best of intentions, a number of unnerving health trends are being linked with increased human contamination by chemical hormones.

The chemicals responsible for causing endocrine system dysfunctions have been used in common pesticides and industrial chemicals for decades. Known as environmental estrogens, these chemicals can actually mimic the hormone estrogen that naturally occurs in the human body. These synthetic hormones have the capacity to severely alter one's endocrine system, leading to an increased risk of major health problems, including breast cancer.

Breast cancer is expected to strike over 180,000 American women in 1996, and the lifetime risk for the disease has increased from a 1 in 20 chance in the 1950's to a 1 in 8 chance today. Breast cancer is the leading cause of death of women between the ages of 35 and 52, and 70 percent of newly diagnosed cases have no family history of this deadly cancer.

Environmental estrogens are largely responsible for these alarming figures. A recent study by the Mount Sinai School of Medicine showed that women with high exposures to DDT had four times the breast cancer risk of women with low exposures.

No matter how careful we are in watching what we eat and drink, exposure to chemical hormones is unavoidable in today's world. They occur in the herbicides we apply to our lawns, shoe polishes, paints, paper products we use every day, and in pesticides on the food we eat.

While we still have much to learn about toxic chemicals, what we do know thus far is cause for major concern and serious action. As a member of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I am proud to have supported the passage of the Safe Drinking Water Act amendments in the Commerce Committee markup last week. This important legislation includes

many reform proposals which address the most serious risks presented by contaminants in drinking water. The proposed amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act will provide for an estrogenic substances screening program. Under this program, substances will be measured to determine if they produce effects in humans similar to those produced by naturally occurring estrogens.

In 1971, Congress passed the National Cancer Act, increasing resources for cancer research and broadening the mandate of the National Cancer Institute, a subsidiary of the National Institutes of Health. The infusion of funds following this act led to the genetic revolution in cancer and biomedicine in general. Continued funding for the NIH represents an investment in research as well as in investment to improve the Nation's health.

To protect the rights of those with identifiable disease characteristics like breast cancer in their genetic makeup, I have introduced H.R. 2690, the Genetic Privacy Act. This legislation will ensure that the new discoveries made in genetic testing research are not misused. For example, in the past 2 years, BRCA 1 and BRCA 2 were identified as major breast cancer genes. Together they account for perhaps 90 percent of familial breast cancer.

While this finding indeed benefits women, enabling them to take necessary preventive measures, negative consequences are also very likely. My bill establishes guidelines concerning disclosure and use of genetic information with regard to insurability, employability, and confidentiality.

Reducing the burden of cancer can be measured in terms of fewer deaths, fewer new cases, increased length of survival, and increased quality of life of cancer survivors. While improvements in cancer treatment have been made, overall cancer incidence continues to rise, emphasizing the formidable task ahead. The goal of a reduced cancer burden can only be achieved by the successful translation of discoveries to the benefit of all people who are at risk and who have been diagnosed with cancer.

Last weekend marked the seventh annual national race for the cure. The race was named "Doing It For Martha" in honor of Martha Maloney, a longtime staffer of Senator WENDELL FORD. The race will serve as a reminder to everyone of the impending threat of breast cancer. I was proud to have my staff participating as a team in the 1996 race for the cure.

Cervantes once said, "The beginning of health is to know the disease." To succeed in the fight against cancer requires that we have the vision to recognize new opportunities and the flexibility and energy to capture such opportunities for progress. Our responsibility is to all people, for cancer threatens all of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that a cooperative effort by Congress, the scientific community, and regulators will