

cure. We have some areas where we agree and others where we do not. But the bottom line is that we are in the minority and we do not control the process here. Unless the Republican leadership and the chairmen of the committees have hearings, let legislation come to the floor, set a deadline when we can consider these bills, nothing is going to happen.

All we have really been doing for the last month or so on the floor here almost every night or every other night is to demand that some action be taken, and that the Republicans allow some of these bills to come up.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a few comments, and I would like to engage my colleague in a colloquy on his legislation, though he has been kind enough to acknowledge that there are many others. We are not here to at this time debate the pieces of legislation.

I think something is important that goes to the point that we have now agreed with on the average person having access to the United States Congress. One of the most successful processes is, as the term is used, bundling. I want to raise that because it does not sound good. It is important as we have the discussion that people would understand that there are a lot of processes in campaign finance that are not negative, that are in fact enhancing and helpful.

If we do not get on with the people's business of debating, we are going to get the American people so angry they are not going to be able to accept anything that may come forth, and there are some positive aspects.

I might ask my colleague, the gentleman from California, one that comes to mind, of course, is a group that so intelligently organized around helping women to get to the United States Congress. I was one of them who received the support. The minute I received the support from this group by the name of Emily's List, that takes \$10 and \$5 and \$1 from women across the Nation, it seemed to be a band of acceptance. And certainly I started with very little in running for this office.

But it is important for people to understand that there can be good concepts that allow the average citizen to give a dollar, and before he or she knows it, a person who they care about, who has their principles, can be elected because someone in New York gave \$1 or someone in Florida gave \$1.

Would the gentleman just share with us how he perceives that to help diversify and help this Congress?

Mr. FARR of California. Let me explain that by going back to the State that I represent, California. When I was in the California legislature we had to run for that office with very tough rules in the State, disclosure rules. Essentially those rules have been drastically amended and modified by an

initiative that the people enacted last November which severely restricts not only what contributions can be given, but how much one can spend in a campaign.

The point is that running for public office is a very exciting opportunity. We ought to allow people to receive contributions. I think we can limit the amount of contributions, and we can limit the category of those contributions, but we ought not to limit the source of contributions. By that, going back to the gentlewoman's point, is that Emily's List, like others, there is the Wish List, a more conservative group, but there are groups out here that call out to people who are on their lists, who have signed up and said we are supportive of your cause.

A mail solicitation goes out to those people and says, "By the way, Mrs. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas is running for Congress. We support her activities. She is a woman, she has served in the Texas legislature, she has a distinguished background, and we think she warrants election to the United States Congress, and would you women around the country please send us a small contribution. Together we will put these contributions together; that is called bundling, and we will send them to SHEILA JACKSON-LEE."

I do not see any problem with that. That organization does not come down here and lobby. It does not ask for any votes. It does not have an agenda in politics. What it is doing is trying to elect the right people to public office. There are a lot of groups like that. I do not think we ought to restrict them. Some of these campaign finance reform bills say that should not happen.

I was a former Peace Corps volunteer. When I ran for Congress I wrote people that I served in the Peace Corps with. Why? They knew me. I was also in a university. I wrote to the people that were in my class in the university. I graduated from a high school. I wrote to the kids that were in that high school. Some lived in my district, some lived in the State, some lived out of State.

When you run for public office, the way you get elected and the way you start a campaign is call up your friends and your family. I called up my family, and they are Republicans and I am a Democrat, and they said, we will support you. We probably never supported a Democrat before, but we will support you because we are your family. That is the way you get into public life. None of these bills should stifle that.

What we are trying to talk about is finance reform. Take the incredible obscenity of having to spend \$1 million to get elected to the United States Congress. The bill that I propose, and almost all of them, recognize that the average costs of a campaign to the United States Congress is a little over half a million dollars; \$600,000. That is the cap. We say you do not need to spend more than that to get elected.

We also say the way you collect money ought to be limited. You ought

to have how much money you can raise from PAC's, and it cannot all come from there; how much can come from wealthy individuals, it cannot all come from there; how much can come from yourself, you cannot just pay for your own campaign out of your own pocket. That way we allow this diversity of contributions to be getting in, limiting the amount, limiting the total capacity of that particular area, and allow you then to run a competitive campaign for \$600,000 or less.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the comments the gentleman made. I know that our time is running out, because we want to yield for another special order tonight, but there are going to be a lot more opportunities.

We are going to be here every night, if necessary, to make the point that we want campaign finance reform to come to the floor, and that the Republican leadership has an obligation to make sure that that happens in this session of Congress and as soon as possible.

I thank the Members again for joining with me. This is just the beginning of a lot more discussion on this topic.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I certainly hope that the outrage over \$50 million is something that we can focus more on what we should be, which is getting real campaign finance reform.

Mr. FARR of California. It is too bad we have to schedule a special order to discuss campaign finance reform. We ought to be doing this in a regular session, in a regular time, to vote on a bill, not just to talk about the bill.

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

NAFTA TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for the remaining 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], and the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

I want to commend them for their discussion here this evening, and echo their comments with respect to making sure that we have campaign finance on the floor of the House of Representatives, so all sides and all issues and all facets of this complex issue can be heard by the American people, and we can make some decisions that will move us away from this terribly corrosive system we are now engaged in.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to kind of shift gears here and talk about something that has been very important to I think the country, an issue that will be before this body very shortly. That is trade. I am joined by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. RON KLICK], who I think will also share some views and comments on NAFTA.

That is what I want to talk about today, because we are about to embark upon another fast-track agreement which will get us into a series of trade agreements with not only Chile but other Latin American countries, and other countries around the world. My concern is that it will be done without proper labor protections and environmental protections. That is why I think it is important to review the NAFTA debate.

Four years ago we had a major debate over the North American Free Trade Agreement. For those of us who fought the treaty back then, one that protects human rights and labor rights and environmental rights, that is what we wanted, we came to the floor of the House, and we are here again tonight to describe the flaws as we see it in NAFTA.

Four years ago, we had a vigorous debate that lasted months, and it culminated in a dramatic finish here on the House floor in a very important vote for the country, and, indeed, for the country of Mexico and Canada as well.

Then we watched as NAFTA took effect. We did not come to the floor night after night and say, it is not working, it is not working, it is not working. We hoped that we were wrong, that it, indeed, would work. But we knew, I think, not only in our minds but we knew in our hearts that the treaty was flawed and it could not work. Many of us saw problems. We saw major problems.

Those of us who fought for a better treaty back then are just as determined today to make sure that the faults of NAFTA are addressed today, because today this debate, as I said, is moving into a new phase. Supporters of NAFTA now want to expand it to new countries. Let me tell the Members, expanding it now would be like building a new room onto your house when your kitchen is on fire and your roof is collapsing.

Before we expand NAFTA, we have to fix it. There are a lot of things to fix. It is no longer a question of theory. We have had about 38 months to look, to digest, to understand, to take apart, and to see what effect it has had on workers here in this country and in Mexico, and in Canada. NAFTA has had 38 months to prove itself. We have seen the effects that NAFTA has had on our families and our jobs and our communities, and the news is not good. I think by any measure people have to understand that NAFTA has been a failure.

Let us look at our trade balance with Mexico, the simplest measure of performance. I have a chart right here. Before NAFTA, before NAFTA we had a \$1.7 billion surplus. Thirty-eight months later we have a \$16.2 billion trade deficit with Mexico.

NAFTA proponents will say trade has expanded 20 percent between the countries. That is true, but it is expanding in the wrong direction. In 1993, before

NAFTA, we had this surplus. Now we have this deficit. That means that we are going in the wrong way, Mr. Speaker. Our trade deficit with Mexico is now at a record \$16 billion.

NAFTA proponents will argue that the reason we have this deficit, which causes jobs, is because they had this thing called the peso devaluation. For some of the Members who are not familiar with what happened in Mexico right after NAFTA, the value of their currency, the peso, which was way overvalued, and we said so on the House floor, and we said it would be a terrible mistake to go ahead with the treaty, with the peso overvalued the way it was driven up by the speculators, we said that that was happening and was going to continue to happen, and it would fall apart, and it would have a dramatic effect on the workers.

That is exactly what happened. When the peso crashed, Uncle Sam came in to try to rescue them by providing them loans. In addition to that, we had the Mexican workers wake up one morning and 40 percent of the value of their savings, their life savings, the currency they had in their pocket, was gone through devaluation. You can imagine waking up and finding 40 percent of your worth just gone the next morning.

NAFTA proponents argue that the peso devaluation really was the problem, and that is why we have the deficit. But the facts do not bear that out. The trends were in place long before this peso devaluation.

If the peso devaluation were the only reasons, other nations would suffer the trade deficit as well, but when we look at the record in trade between Japan and Mexico, and the European countries and Mexico, we will find that they have maintained their surpluses before, during NAFTA, and after the peso crash. Our trade balance had become a deficit 4 months before the peso crash. It had been trending that way for several months prior to that. So the facts show that NAFTA is the cause of this deficit, not the peso devaluation.

Next, let us take a look at the job claim by NAFTA proponents. I will get this chart down here. I think this is pretty self-explanatory: Jobs Lost Under NAFTA.

Remember back in 1993, when we debated this, we all kept hearing that the proponents said we would create 200,000 jobs, 200,000 jobs. We heard that figure over and over again. NAFTA proponents practically guaranteed us that 200,000 more jobs would be created if we passed NAFTA.

□ 2015

But using their own formula, which is based on the numbers of jobs created through a certain dollar amount of trade, we have lost over 600,000 jobs or job opportunities since NAFTA took effect. And by using a very narrow definition by the Department of Labor, which includes only those workers who have applied and then been certified for NAFTA unemployment benefits, more

than 110,000, 110,000 U.S. workers have already been certified under the NAFTA unemployment program.

Thousands more have filed for the benefits and have not been certified but some eventually will get them. So the figure on the job loss was not 200,000 created, as the NAFTA supporters told us time and time again. It is somewhere between 600,000 and 110,000 that we know of and have been certified. And not all workers qualify for those benefits, as I said.

Workers in more than 1400 factories in 48 States have applied for these NAFTA job retraining programs. But as we all know too well, these workers will not likely be moved into high-tech and high-wage jobs, as trade theory suggests.

In fact, listen to this number, 65 percent of workers who were laid off ended up with lower paying jobs; 65 percent of the workers displaced in this country who were laid off ended up with lower paying jobs.

When we debated NAFTA, many corporations stepped forward to say that jobs in the U.S. depended upon NAFTA's passage. They promised to create jobs in America. Corporation after corporation, multinational after multinational corporation said they were going to create jobs.

Next chart: Broken promises under NAFTA. Ninety percent of companies failed to deliver on their promise to create U.S. jobs if NAFTA passed, 90 percent. In the weeks to come, we will be going through all of these corporations, corporation by corporation, plant by plant, worker by worker, to let you know how this has unfolded. But tonight let me just give you one example.

Let us start at the end of the alphabet with Zenith, well-known TV maker. Here is what Zenith said in 1993 during the NAFTA debate. It said, Contrary to numerous reports that companies like Zenith Electronic Corporation will transfer all of their production facilities to Mexico as a result of NAFTA, the NAFTA offers the prospect of more jobs at the company's Melrose Park, Illinois facility.

Here is what Zenith did. Zenith announced late last year that it was laying off 800 of its 3000 workers at Melrose Park. In addition, 510 workers have been certified for NAFTA trade adjustment assistance at Zenith facilities in Springfield, MO and Chicago, IL.

So these are the real life facts and the real life effects of NAFTA, and we will be making sure that the public understands what other corporations have said and what they have not delivered.

Let me talk about what I think is the real crux and the problem with NAFTA and what it has done to the workers here in this country. I want to talk about the Mexican workers a little bit later as well.

What has really happened here in this country is the downward pressure on U.S. wages that has resulted from

the North American Free Trade Agreement, the downward pressure on wages.

There was a study done at Cornell University for the Department of Labor. And listen to this, they found that 62 percent of U.S. employers, 62 percent, threatened to close plants rather than negotiate with or recognize a union, implying or explicitly threatening to move jobs to Mexico, 62 percent. People wonder why 80 percent of the workers in this country have had their wages basically frozen or decline for close to the past 20 years. It is that bargaining chip. It is that downward pressure on wages. It is the leverage they have because of agreements like this and, I might also add, because people are not standing up for their collective right to join together and bargain.

Unions in this country made the middle class. At their zenith, at their height in the 1940's in this country, when almost 40 percent of the private sector employees in this country belonged to unions, you saw incomes rise, benefits rise, health care, pensions. Down to about 12 percent today, union membership. They do not have any power at the bargaining table today, the workers do not. The companies, they say to these folks, listen, you want a higher wage, you want a livable wage, you want health care benefits for your family, you want a guaranteed pension, I will tell you what, we cannot afford it, we are going south, you keep this up.

And yet you look at CEO salaries in America today. They are out of sight. They are paying this guy at Disney, we all grew up on Disney, loved it, watched it, Michael Eisner, \$776 million, 10-year contract, \$776 million. I mean, am I missing something here? Did Mickey Mouse negotiate a peace treaty in the Middle East? What enables somebody to accumulate \$776 million?

So these are the discrepancies that are occurring here in this society between the highest income earners, the top people at these corporations, these multinationals and workers who are having their wages bargained down at the table.

Let us take another example. At the Connor Rubber near Fort Wayne, IN, in the midst of the union's first contract negotiations, the company decided to close the plant and move to Mexico. Same union pulled an organization petition at a neighborhood subsidiary of Connor Rubber. The union official who was organizing the subsidiary said that wages were lacking, their benefits were lacking, but they also wanted a job.

So this is having a dampening effects on wages in America. Fifty-seven percent of Americans now say their purchasing power is worse than it was before NAFTA, 57 percent.

And the situation in Mexico is even worse. As I said, the Mexican economy basically collapsed. The maquiladora, the area along the U.S. and Mexican border in Texas and New Mexico, Arizona and California, production has

soared but wages have fallen by 25 percent. When we debated NAFTA, the maquiladora workers were making \$1 an hour; now they are making 70 cents an hour. Workers who try to form unions are being fired or thrown in jail.

I was down there a month ago. I visited some of these villages and colonias in Tijuana and talked with some of these leaders and these workers. One of these leaders told me at his community colonia in the community house where there were lots of people, he said to me, Congressman, I went there and talked to the company about slowing down the line because a lot of the people who lived in this community were losing fingers and hands. Instead they sped the line up. So we organized and we stopped work, and they fired me. And they threw me in jail for trying to organize a union.

That is what we are up against and that is what is happening and that is what is going on.

NAFTA has not created to a consumer market in Mexico. It has created an export platform. As a nation we now ship more consumer goods to Switzerland than we do to Mexico. A good example is the auto industry. From 1994 to 1995, production in the maquiladora for the domestic Mexican market plummeted 72 percent, but production for exports to the United States grew by 36 percent. We are selling fewer cars to Mexico. Folks there do not have the money to buy it. When your income drops 40 percent overnight and when they are paying you 70 cents an hour, it is hard to afford to buy an automobile.

As a result, our trade deficit in the auto sector ballooned to more than \$15 billion. And meanwhile the environment is suffering the consequences as well. Families along the border continue to live near and bathe in and drink water that the American Medical Association has called a cesspool of infectious disease, a cesspool of infectious disease.

Human health risks on the U.S. Mexican border. The estimated cost to clean up the border is \$20 billion. Remember the debate we had here about the North American Development Bank which was set up to fix these environmental and health problems? After 38 months the bank has yet to make a single meaningful loan for the public good. They have made a loan to a private development for \$2.5 million, but that is a far cry from the \$20 billion in infrastructure needs that they need in order to fix the environment along the border.

What is more, NAFTA has helped create what some call a wave line border check. Listen to this: 11,000 trucks now pass over the border from Mexico every day, 11,000. For every truck that gets inspected, 199 do not. They are just waved through, for God knows what is on those trucks. They are just waved through.

Every single week we seem to see another story of corruption at the high-

est levels of the Mexican government. Is this tragic? Yes. Is it permanent? It does not have to be. We still believe that NAFTA can be a force for progress. We still believe we can create a consumer market in Mexico.

But before we ever think about expanding NAFTA to other countries, we need to fix a very flawed NAFTA here. We need to give workers the same kind of labor and health protections that we gave companies for things like intellectual property. We need to include labor and environmental standards in the core agreement, not in some flimsy side agreement. And we need to raise Mexico's standard to our level, not lower ours to theirs.

We need to make noncompliance subject to sanctions, not just consultations. And we need to remember this is not just about markets and trade barriers, this is about jobs and living standards. It is about human rights and human dignity.

Workers on both sides of the border are mistreated by multinational corporations and indifferent governments. But they remain brave and they remain hopeful. And until they have a voice to speak for themselves, we must continue to be their voice.

There are more people in this Congress, I might add to my colleagues, who voted against NAFTA four years ago than voted for it, and many who voted for it say that they would never vote for it again. We look forward to this debate.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], who has been so eloquent and strong on this issue of protecting jobs and expanding job opportunities and harmonizing Mexican benefits to our level instead of bringing ours down to theirs.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the minority whip, for again leading us in this issue. And I just want to underline, first of all, before I start, some of the points that the gentleman made because they are very important.

No. 1, he pointed out the fact that we are not against free trade. Those of us who come here to the well and who have said this is a flawed NAFTA agree that a NAFTA agreement can be good. We can negotiate something that can work. We can have free trade with Mexico, with Canada, with Argentina, with Chile, with the Caribbean Basin, with Europe, but it has to be fair trade. And we got the short end of the stick.

His other point that he made at the very beginning is one that is very important. After we lost, it was a very close vote, it was a very hard fought vote, many of us put our sweat and our tears and our lives for many months into fighting for the working people of this country, something that we felt very strongly was going to be flawed, but when NAFTA passed, we went back to work doing other things. We did not come to the well of the House day after day, week after week, month after month, pointing to every small thing

that occurred and blaming it on NAFTA. We did not say that because so many people in America got a cold or the flu it was NAFTA's fault, just because a factory closed down here and closed down there, it was NAFTA's fault. We did not make that point.

We wanted to be wrong. We were hoping that the promises of 200,000 jobs that were made by the proponents of NAFTA would take place and that many of those jobs would occur in the gentleman's district in Michigan and my district in Pennsylvania and some of our other friends in Ohio and California and across this country.

□ 2030

That was our hope. Unfortunately, that has not occurred.

As my friend pointed out, what really we have seen is promises broken. All of those companies, many of those companies which came out making all kinds of promises, telling us all of the wonderful things that were going to occur, we called them the NAFTA poster companies. They would come out with fancy flyers saying we are going to create these jobs. Indeed, 60 of the 67 companies that made specific promises about jobs that would be created, in fact have not fulfilled those promises of job creation. In many instances they have eliminated jobs. Some of those companies are no longer even doing business with Mexico.

The gentleman's point about the fact that when NAFTA passed we had a small \$1.7 billion a year trade surplus with Mexico, and now we have a booming trade deficit with Mexico, I would remind all of my colleagues this occurs, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are including as exports to Mexico the factory equipment that we are sending down there by companies that have closed down their factories in this country and are moving that factory equipment and those jobs to Mexico. That counts as a surplus. That counts as goods that we are selling to Mexico. That is not legitimate goods and services. Those will, in fact, be used against us.

The increase of the U.S. trade deficit with Mexico and Canada has cost, we believe, about 420,000 jobs. Half a million jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. Good paying jobs, in many instances.

Mr. KLINK. The gentleman is correct. These were good paying jobs. And as the gentleman said, when these workers were displaced they did not get good paying jobs.

My State of Pennsylvania is one of the top two in NAFTA trade adjustment assistance applications. For those people that do not understand, that is a very complex procedure that you qualify or you apply for benefits based on the fact that you lost your job because of NAFTA. Not everyone who has lost their job because of NAFTA has qualified for NAFTA TA benefits or even applied for them. So this is only one part of the puzzle when we try to

determine the precise number of jobs that we have lost in this country. That is very convoluted.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman makes a good point. And the other piece I want to talk about for just a second with him is, it was 60-some percent, I think it was 65 percent I mentioned, of people who lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA and jobs moving to Mexico, people who have found other jobs have found them at lower pay. If an individual was making maybe \$12 an hour, they may have found another job but it may be at \$7 or \$8 an hour.

So what happens when that occurs in a family? Their standard of living is diminished considerably, so they go out and get another job. They have 2 jobs, 3 jobs, to make sure that income level in the family is where it had been. What does that do?

Mr. KLINK. If the gentleman will yield, that is when they find out they have less time to put into their family and their community.

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct. They are not there for soccer for their kids, they are not there after school when their kids come home, or to help with PTA and the other community efforts. That is the untold factor here that we are dealing with as a result of this downward pressure on wages and job loss.

I thank my colleague for raising that point.

Mr. KLINK. When we heard all of these predictions about the 200,000 jobs that were going to be created almost immediately by this NAFTA agreement, there was an assumption by both the Bush and the Clinton Administrations. This had been started during the Bush administration and then was finished by the Clinton administration. Both administrations made their predictions based on the fact that they anticipated we would have a trade surplus with Mexico for at least 15 years. Immediately, the year after NAFTA passed, we went into a trade deficit with Mexico.

The shift from a small surplus of \$1.7 billion back in 1993 to a deficit of \$16 billion in 1996 in trade with Mexico really has to be explained by the devaluation of the Mexican peso. And, as the gentleman said just moments ago, and I think he did a great job of explaining it, NAFTA was responsible for that devaluation.

Then what occurred in this country, and I do have a copy of the study from Cornell University that the gentleman talked about, it is called a Final Report, the Effects of Plant Closing or Threat of Plant Closing on the Right of Workers to Organize. He is absolutely right, 62 percent of the employers in this country, 62 percent of them said "We will close our plant rather than to negotiate a contract with you" or "If you want to form a union, we are closing our plant. We can now go to Mexico."

That happened all across this country, if we read this report, which the

proponents of extending fast track so that we can expand this horrible agreement without fixing it, they do not want us to read this report.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments, and I apologize to my friend from California. I know he wanted to make a comment about fast track, and I am sorry, I did not realize we were short on time.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for coming out and talking to us this evening about his views on this issue, and we look forward to a hearty debate. And, again, I say to my friend from California, I look forward to participating with him in this as well.

LESSONS IN EDUCATION, THE IMPACT OF NEW SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, before I begin with my comments, which are a series and talk about where we are going in education, I want to yield a few minutes to my colleague from California to talk about a project that I have some interest in and I may learn something tonight about, a patent bill that he has proposed and a number of my constituents have called me about.

So I want to yield some time to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. There will be a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives next month, probably the middle of next month, that will mean a great deal not only to every Member of the House of Representatives but to every citizen of the United States of America.

As we just listened to our colleagues from the other side of the aisle talking about some of their observations of what has happened with the treaty with Mexico and some of the other economic dealings that we have seen in recent years, it is clear that there is an elite in the U.S. Government and in the United States and in our financial institutions who are not loyal to the interests of the people of the United States.

This lack of loyalty perhaps is due to the fact that they have a vision for a better world. They are trying to create a global economy and, thus, they are willing to sacrifice the interests of the American people. They are willing to sacrifice the standard of living, the freedom and the prosperity, and actually the national security of our country in order to build this more perfect world and a global economy.

I think that this has manifested itself in NAFTA and some of these other things, the GATT. But we will have a vote in one month on H.R. 400, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act. My legislation, H.R. 811 and 812, will be there as a substitute for this horrible piece of legislation that is the