

Actually, it is 3.3 million trucks entering this country, and we are inspecting 1 percent. And we say, how can there be an increase in drugs coming into this country? The truck may say "bananas," but we do not know what is really in there because we are not inspecting it. They all know that.

Then we have a NAFTA Agreement which limits our ability to make the inspection at the border and to limit the number of trucks that will be inspected. So the more trucks you bring up, the less are going to be inspected, the greater chance of getting through whatever you want, be it contraband, be it fruits or vegetables laced with DDT.

Again, this is not just us who oppose NAFTA saying this. This is found in the Government Accounting Office May 1997 report. It is all documented. And their recommendations that we have been talking about here tonight are certainly contained in here.

Again, I think the issue here is not necessarily a trade agreement, but really a safety agreement: What standards are we going to apply? Do we lower our standards to allow more goods to come in this country? Is that not what this is really about? What are the standards, and should we not all go by the same standards?

We have to have standards. We have them for, as I said earlier, for patent law, intellectual property, compact disks. Remember the big fight with China on that? We have these standards and enforce them, but somehow when it comes to food safety, the environment, labor, we are not going to enforce it? I think there are some very good arguments here that must be made. What is the rush? Let us slow this thing down.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is exactly the point, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield. We in this country for a long time, for a lot of years, have raised our living standards with pure food laws, with strong clean air laws, with good, solid safe drinking water laws, on fights that were conducted in this Chamber, where often groups of very conservative Members that had major backing from the largest corporations in the country would oppose clean water laws, would oppose safe drinking laws, would oppose pure food laws.

Over a period of decades after decades after decades, beginning in the early part of this century when books were written about contaminated food and all the problems with our food supply, over those many, many years, we have built probably the best standards to protect all people in this country; not just the rich, not just the poor, not just white, not just black, not just men, not just women, everyone.

We have protected people because they know when they go to the grocery store that meat is inspected. They know that there are clean air and clean water requirements. We know when we go shopping that the food we buy is

generally, almost 100 percent of the time, good, clean, safe food. What we are doing is we are having our standards pulled down by a country that has not had those kinds of protections built into their laws, and has not had that kind of history.

Rather than allow them to pull our standards down, we can negotiate trade agreements that would pull their standards up. And we are going in the exact opposite direction. That is why we need to pursue the kinds of efforts the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is pursuing with his work.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to say, I know earlier today the gentleman had spoken up at a meeting about the need for more enforcement, and I think the response was that, well, we need more money. Congress should appropriate more money for enforcement. I sort of laughed and said to myself, well, if we do not have the ability, if this body, if this House of Representatives and the other body are not going to appropriate the money to do the enforcement, to make sure the inspections take place, then we should not be supporting NAFTA and fast track.

□ 2345

I want to say that if this same group of elected officials are going to say that we are not going to provide the funding to make sure these enforcement measures take place, then they should not be supporting NAFTA and should not be supporting fast track.

I think my colleague from Ohio comes right to the point, because he is saying what are we going to put first here? We are going to put the mechanisms to make sure the laws are properly enforced; that the environmental laws are enforced; that there is not going to be the ratcheting down or the weakening of standards, whether it is labor standards or it is environmental standards. And once we have those guarantees in place, both here and in the country we are entering into this trade agreement with, then, sure, we can move toward free trade, but not have the cart before the horse, or whatever the term is, and that is what we are getting now.

We are being told the most important thing is to have the agreement, because the flag of free trade is the most important flag and we have to wave that wherever we are in the world. And in the meantime we will try to use our good devices to try to convince some of these other governments that they should have better environmental standards or better labor standards. But that is secondary and we cannot really talk to them about that now because they might be offended by it and we have to enter these agreements and wave that free trade flag.

I do not buy it, and I am glad the gentlemen with me here tonight do not buy it and, hopefully, we will not have a lot of other people buy it when this comes up a couple of weeks from now.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is amazing that the

President indicated at the caucus today that the way to get around this and to make sure there is inspection and food safety at the border is to increase the inspections. And if Congress will not appropriate the money, the heck with it, let us just move forward with this trade agreement anyway as the fast track trade agreement.

But, remember, it was 2 or 3 weeks ago the administration was up here pushing for more regulation, more regulation for more inspection in this country for meats, poultry, and they continued to raise concerns about pesticides being used in this country. If we cannot control and inspect adequately, and the Secretary of Agriculture wants more regulations and more authority to invoke emergency powers to take food off our tables and the grocery store shelves, if we cannot do it within our own country, because we do not have enough people and they need more authority, how will we do it on items coming into this country where we inspect 1 percent of everything that comes in? It defies their argument. It defies their logic.

So I certainly hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I am glad to see the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is here helping us out on this issue tonight and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE]. I hope they will all join us in sending a letter to the President urging him to include specific food safety provisions in his fast track proposal.

And we welcome all Members, Democrats, Republicans, Independents to sign this letter because, as we said earlier, what we want to know is what are the rules of the game? What are the rules of the trade game? We should not lower our standards as a country. We should not lower the health and safety requirements of this country. We have rules that affect intellectual property rights, compact disks, patent law. Why can those same standards, those same rules not be afforded to labor, the environment but especially food safety? Let us not fast track our standards, our safety and our families' health and security.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you and the staff, I said I would be brief, but I was joined by all my friends here tonight, that I could not anticipate, so we went a little longer.

CHANGES THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for the remainder of time until midnight, or 11 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. I think I can do it all in 11 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I thought I would just come to the floor tonight and talk about several issues. I was late to the special order of the gentleman from California [Mr.

BILBRAY] where he spoke about his bill which would disallow automatic citizenship to the children of people who have come into the United States illegally. He went through a fairly lengthy litany of court cases and legal precedent behind the rule of law, the idea that coming to this country and achieving citizenship requires certain accountability and certain responsibilities and that that status should not be conferred; that is, citizenship should not be conferred on people who have come into the country using trickery or deceit or simply forcing their way in or simply walking across a land border.

The theme I think of the gentleman's special order, and I thought it was an excellent special order, was that when an individual comes to the United States that they should use the front door; do not come in through the back door. And it is only appropriate that we reserve citizenship for people who have used the front door. I applaud him for that and wish I could have been here earlier, and I apologize to him for missing his special order. I think it was excellent and I think his legislation is very timely.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about another person tonight who is a very important person to many of us in Congress who fought in what I call the contra wars in the 1980's. Those were the legislative debates that drove, to a large degree, American policy in the 1980's during the Reagan administration with respect to Central America, and particularly with respect to the Soviet Union's attempt to transfer a terroristic guerilla operation from the Soviet Union and from its client states into the guerilla operations in El Salvador, Guatemala, and in Nicaragua, manifested there by the Sandinistan Government.

We saw the Soviets, then Soviets, moving in with tons of munitions, automatic weapons, all kinds of explosives, and fostering the guerilla movements in El Salvador that threatened to overthrow that very fragile government which even then had the makings of democracy.

It is interesting, when I came in in 1980, as a freshman, Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, and Nicaragua all had some form of military dictatorship. None of them had, when Ronald Reagan arrived on the scene as President of the United States, none of them had democracies. Today, they all have democracies, albeit fragile.

It was important for us at that point, when they were struggling to achieve those democracies and to put off the terrorism, I can remember in El Salvador when the FMLN, the guerilla operations supported by the Communists, were blowing up electrical plants and were massacring people trying to engage in a harvest, were regularly assassinating state officials, and I remember when Ronald Reagan enunciated the idea that we need to provide a shield, a military shield for these governments like El Salvador and also for the free-

dom fighter movement in Nicaragua, where a few very brave souls were fighting the Sandinistas, the Communist Sandinistas, which were strongly supported by the Soviet Union.

There was enormous debate at that time in the United States, and a number of citizen groups were engaged on both sides trying to persuade the Congress either to stay out of Central America and let the Russians have their way or to engage in Central America and provide the shield that I talked about.

Bill Blakemore of Texas was a Texas businessman who wanted to engage in supporting the Reagan doctrine in Central America, and he put together a group of business people in Texas who came to the Hill and lobbied and did everything they could to see to it that people understood what was at stake in having democracies rather than tyranny in Central America in our own hemisphere.

Bill Blakemore did a great job at that. He did not ask for anything in return. He did not get any money for it. He did not make any contracts. He simply did that work because he thought it was important to be a leader as an American citizen and to fight for and persuade people to do what was right.

□ 2355

He is very ill today in Texas. He is down at his ranch, an Iron Mountain ranch near Marathon, TX. So I want to say to Bill Blakemore and all the people that helped him, thank you for what you did for this country. Because partly because of your efforts, we now have democracies, fragile democracies in that part of the hemisphere, and that has accrued to the benefit of the United States.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, before I end my time, I wanted to say that my friend Bob Dornan has taken a lot of flak from Members on the other side of the aisle, Democrat Members, for the simple fact that after his election, which he won on Election Day by several hundred votes and then lost later when they counted absentee ballots, when they discovered that one group had fraudulently registered and voted a number over 300, that number of illegal voters, Mr. Dornan raised a question "Were there more?" And he raised a question as to whether or not he had really lost that election. In fact, the question was who had gotten the most votes, the most legal votes.

He had every right to do that. And we, as a House of Representatives, should be very concerned when we see one group that fraudulently votes 300 illegal voters on Election Day, telling them, manipulating them and telling them as non-citizens that they not only had the right but the duty as non-citizens to vote in an American election.

So we are now undergoing a very thorough review of that voting situation to validate or to follow through on

a very simple principle, and that is the person with the most votes wins in a democracy. Now why is that anathema to the other side? Why do they not want to see the votes counted?

So we are almost at the end of that situation. And I just wanted to say that I think Mr. Dornan has comported himself in an absolutely fine manner. He has raised the question. He has every right to raise it. I think we have as much interest as he has and as the gentlewoman from Californian [Ms. SANCHEZ] has in seeing who got the most votes in that election.

So the House administration committee is going to be coming up with the results of that analysis fairly soon, and I look forward to it.

On a personal note, nobody fought for the pro-life cause as hard, as energetically, as compassionately and as passionately as Bob Dornan. And I thought it was kind of appropriate here just a few days after Mother Theresa's untimely death to remind our colleagues how valiantly Bob Dornan fought for people who did not have big political action committees and did not have enormous clout on the House floor, and were not CEOs and did not have all the things that generally drive and manifest influence in the city of Washington, DC.

He fought for the most helpless of individuals, that is, unborn children. He never wavered. He always came up with the right amendments at the right time, standing side-by-side with guys like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

We miss Bob Dornan. We miss that passion that he brought to the debate. As a member of the Committee on National Security, I can remember when our Rangers were killed in Somalia. And Bob Dornan, the only member of the committee who had the nerve and energy to do it, flew all the way to Somalia and debriefed all of the people or many of the people who had been involved in that combat, and came back and contacted the families of every Ranger who was killed in Somalia and talked to them about the incident and thanked them for the service of their loved one to this country.

Bob Dornan was a great, great member of the Committee on National Security. He was also one of the few guys that actually flew all the planes, went out and looked at all the equipment, had a great analysis of what worked and what did not work, and brought great energy and great expertise to that committee.

Lastly, Bob Dornan was a guy when I was a freshman who gave up his seat that he could have had on the Committee on National Security, then the old Armed Services Committee, to a new freshman from San Diego. That freshman was myself. I am very grateful to Bob for the friendship that he has shown me and many other Members of the House over the years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply conclude my remarks by saying that I

wish Bob Dornan the very best and his wonderful family the very best, and I think that the results of this research and this analysis will be out before the House in the next several weeks.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BILBRAY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, on September 17.

Mr. PAXON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on September 17.

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, on September 18.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EDWARDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. CAPPS.

Mr. SKELTON.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. RUSH.

Mr. FILNER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BILBRAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. TALENT.

Mr. HYDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUNTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. MCINNIS.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock a.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 17, 1997, at 10 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 695. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of U.S. persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; with an amendment (Rept. 105-108, Pt. 4). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 2477. A bill to enforce the guarantees of the 1st, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States by prohibiting certain devices used to deny the right to participate in certain elections; to the Committee on House Oversight.

H.R. 2478. A bill to require that candidates who receive campaign financing from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund agree not to participate in multicandidate forums that exclude candidates who have broad-based public support; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. ENSIGN:

H.R. 2479. A bill to authorize a study by the National Academy of Sciences on the migration of plutonium underground at the Nevada Test Site; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GANSKE (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 2480. A bill to provide for the approval of a petition pending at the Food and Drug Administration to allow the use of low-dose irradiation to pasteurize red meat, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2481. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify that records of arrival or departure are not required to be collected for purposes of the automated entry-exit control system developed under section 110 of such Act for Canadians who are not otherwise required to possess a visa, passport, or border crossing identification card; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 2482. A bill to require that the Secretary of Agriculture include an estimate of the cost to produce milk whenever the Secretary announces the basic formula price for milk to be used under Federal milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAXON:

H.R. 2483. A bill to terminate the taxes imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 other than Social Security and railroad retirement-related taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2484. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to speed up by 1 year the application of risk adjustment factors under the Medicare Choice Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr.

GOODLING, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) to provide liability relief for small parties, innocent landowners, and prospective purchasers; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. BURTON of Indiana introduced a bill (H.R. 2486) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Southland*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. NEUMANN and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 44: Mr. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 59: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 65: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 84: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 107: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 182: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 292: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. SAM JOHNSON.