

House or anyplace else with a check for \$50,000 or \$100,000. That should be illegal.

We ought to have a vote on the floor of the House and let Members vote whether they think it should be illegal or not. Certainly 80 to 90 percent of the American public think it should be illegal. The Speaker thinks it ought to be legal. He thinks there is not enough money being spent on campaigns in America, and that is the opposite of the truth.

The evidence is overwhelming that the time has come for campaign finance reform. The Speaker says that we need more money involved in this process. The truth is money is corrupting American politics and everyone knows it. We are going to file a bill that will ban soft money, that will give better disclosure requirements, greater disclosure and better enforcement from the Federal Election Commission.

All of us here today believe that the Speaker's desire to vastly increase the amount of money in the current system would be a disaster for democracy. I am confident that the Members of this House are going to stand up to the Speaker and, if we need to do it, we will file a discharge petition and require that there be a vote on the floor of this House to ban soft money.

One person cannot stand in the way of campaign finance reform, and I believe that the membership of this House is ready to take on Speaker GINGRICH and require that there be a vote on campaign finance reform and a vote to abolish soft money.

FAST-TRACK TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks about trade, let me associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who have spoken this afternoon on the issue of campaign reform.

The system in the country is broken. If we ever needed any more evidence of its dilapidated state, all we have to do is pick the morning papers up, listen to the morning radio, watch the evening news. It is zapping the energy, the integrity, the heart of the Democratic system in our country today.

□ 1300

The present system is a disaster. It needs to be scrapped. People spend too much time raising money, going after money, and not enough time focusing on the problems that face this country. I believe we are in a process of watching it die. And it will die, and it will come down.

As my friends and colleagues have said in these last 30 or 40 minutes, they on this side of the aisle, for the most

part, do not get it. The Speaker wants to spend more money. He wants to provide more access to the big boys and take away our ability to have a say in what happens in this very building.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add those notes before I talk about fast track.

Fast track is probably, I could make a transition here, but I will not at this point. I will save that for another day because there is a transition to be made with respect to our trade policies and how this institution operates and how this city operates.

As the vote over NAFTA expansion gets closer, there are a lot of people who are calling for attention. Some are politicians. Some are CEO's. Some speak for farmers. Other stand for labor. Some hire consultants. Some go on TV. Even cartoon characters like Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse have lobbyists in this building and downtown looking after them.

All of these interests have a voice, and they are shouting to be heard. But some of the people with the most at stake in this debate have been silent, or are silent. They do not have a choice. They do not have a choice voice. I am talking about children. I want to talk a little about children before I get into the heart of the trade issue because I believe this gets to the heart of the trade issue.

As many as 11 million children today toil day after day in the fields and in the factories of Mexico. They pick tomatoes. They pick onions. They pick strawberries. They glue soles on shoes. They unload and load crates of produce that weigh more than they do.

Starting at 7 years of age, millions of Mexican children are kept out of school and are forced to work, often exposing them to the most dangerous pesticides and toxins. And we say, "well, is not child labor prohibited under NAFTA?" Sure it is. But the Mexican Government just looks the other way. And what is even worse, multinational corporations in this country, employers who go over and establish businesses in Mexico, and this Government of ours looks the other way as well.

According to the U.S. News and World Report, the three NAFTA governments have not filed a single complaint in Mexican child labor even though it is commonplace, not a single complaint. I am willing to bet that of all the experts touting NAFTA, of all the armchair economists, of all of those pushing fast track expansion today, none of them would want their kids, children, quitting elementary school to pick tomatoes laced with pesticides.

Are they really willing to sacrifice their education, the health and the future of poor Mexican children, at the altar of free trade? Child labor does not just affect lives in Mexico. It is putting downward pressure on the standards in the United States.

How does this work? We say to ourselves, "What has this got to do with

America? What has this got to do with our workers? What has this got to do with our industries?" Well, how can a tomato farmer in Florida who adheres to our labor and environmental standards compete with someone who pays children pennies an hour and who pollutes with impunity?

That is what our workers are up against, our business people are up against, companies that pollute with impunity with these toxins and pesticides, pesticides, by the way, that got into the strawberries, came into this country. One hundred seventy-nine children in Michigan were poisoned with strawberries that were contaminated, some very seriously, life-or-death situations, because those vegetables and those fruits are not checked.

We say, "Well, do they not inspect them when they come into the border?" 3.3 million trucks go across that border every year, 10,000 trucks a day. Do my colleagues know how many of them get inspected? One percent. They call it a wave line. The inspector stands there and waves them on through. The line stretches for miles, truckers honking their horns, and they just wave them on through.

It is not contaminated fruits and vegetables that get through into our market now. It is also what else is in the compartment of those trucks; like 70 percent of all the cocaine that comes into the United States comes from Mexico today. That is another story.

Let me get back to that tomato farmer. He or she cannot compete with what is coming in from Mexico today because in Mexico we have got kids that are 7, 8, 9 picking it for pennies, and we have got pesticides and toxins that are prohibited here being used.

That is why America's trade agreements must include strong, enforceable protection for workers and the environment. That is why we have been coming to the floor day after day, week after week, month after month, saying, Mr. President, colleagues on this side of the aisle, some of my own colleagues, these are the standards that we need to have as we move into this new century of ours. We will be setting the pattern in this fast track on what will be negotiated in trade for the next century.

We cannot stay with the policies that take us back to the conditions of the 19th century, and that is what the administration's policy basically does. It will move us down on wages, on working conditions, on health conditions to a 19th century standard. It will take us back in the past. We need to move people forward. We need to have Mexican workers and Chilean workers and their environments meet the standards that we have established here in the United States rather than our workers coming down to their standards.

Our trade agreement should harness the power of markets to lift standards abroad, not lower ours. And if we sacrifice our standards, we sacrifice not

only standards, but the values, the values that literally hundreds of thousands of workers over the last 100 years in this country sacrificed for. And when I say "sacrificed," we have to kind of flashback in our memories to what our grandparents and our parents did to make sure we got an 8-hour day, a 40-hour workweek, to make sure they got proper medical care, they got health insurance, they got pensions, they got decent wages, they got the right to collective bargaining, they got the right to strike. They got all these rights so they could harness their energies and create the most viable and vibrant middle class in the history of the world.

And now all these things are being eroded because these benefits that were gotten oftentimes by people who marched, who went to jail, who were beaten, some even died in order for these rights in this country, they are being eroded by the fact that companies are moving over to Mexico and other places that do not enforce these rights; and then these companies in this country say, well, we will move our facilities down to Mexico if you do not agree to a wage freeze, if you do not agree to a benefit freeze, if you do not agree to these environmental concerns that we have.

And do not take my word for it. There was a study done by a woman by the name of Kate Brothenbrenner from Cornell University. She found that 62 percent of corporations in America today, 62 percent, have used the NAFTA agreement and similar agreements to bring down or to pressure employees to keep wages and benefits at the same or a lower level. Now that is an incredible downward pressure on benefits and wages that people have fought for for the last 100 years.

Profiting from child labor runs contrary to everything America stands for. Remember the soccer ball situation we had in this country? American kids became aware that they were out there on Saturday and Sunday kicking that soccer ball after school, and someone told them that the people that were stitching those soccer balls together were 6-, 7- and 8-year-olds in Pakistan, who were working 10 hours a day, not going to school, not getting any of the things that they were having, in order for American children to play soccer. So a campaign erupted in this country in which children all over the country and teachers and coaches made an effort to change that. And we changed it. We put pressure, and we changed it.

We need to do the same thing with respect to child labor in Mexico and other parts of this planet that exploit children. If we continue to look the other way instead of addressing it effectively and forcefully in our trade agreements, we betray our values, and we betray our children.

Now let me talk about something else. The administration would like to have fast track in time for the Presi-

dent's trip to South America next month. Beginning on November 12, the President is scheduled to make visits to Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina in order to develop support for creating a free-trade area for the Americas.

For months now the administration has been saying that it is crucial for fast track to be passed by the House before this trip, that it will demonstrate American leadership. Of course, the administration only sent up fast track proposal to Congress last week, and already we know that the fast track that they are asking us to pass is actually a step backward from the Reagan-Bush administration fast track that they used, by the way, to pass NAFTA 4 years ago.

Many of us have said that a new trade negotiating authority must look forward and address issues that have been neglected so far in our trade agreements, because the reality of this phenomenon we call globalization is that workers, our environment, and our food is as affected by these changes as intellectual property, as telecommunications, as automobile production. And those things are protected, the latter thing that I mentioned. Intellectual property, Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck, and Bill Gates, they are protected. Their property is protected. Automobile production, protected. But when it comes to workers' standards, no, no. The difference is that intellectual property and all these things that I talked about and content laws do get addressed, but safe and fair working conditions, environmental standards and ensuring that imported food is safe do not get addressed.

Instead of incorporating these issues into trade negotiations more fully and completely, this fast track proposal actually restricts our ability to include legitimate issues in trade agreements that directly impact consumers and workers. It is clearly, clearly a step backward.

We propose that American leadership be used to develop a trade agreement with Latin America that will lift workers up, not tie them down. We cannot let this fast track be used simply to expand NAFTA, because we know it will not work.

Look at the last 4 years and the impact NAFTA has had on wages and the environment and on food and even on drugs. It is a horrible record. But we are being asked to endorse this record. We are being asked to sanction it, to put our stamp of approval on it, to give it our blessing, to ignore the flaws as they expand NAFTA to other countries in this hemisphere.

The same old argument is being trotted out again as to why we must pass fast track quickly and expand NAFTA. The administration says it is essential that they have this, otherwise they will be left behind in South America; we will lose out to Europe. But that argument does not stand up to the test. They used it 4 years ago to sell us NAFTA.

The NAFTA proponents were saying back then, "If we do not pass NAFTA, Europe and Japan will get into Mexico, and they will lock us out. We will lose out." And the Japanese laughed at that statement, by the way. And the record of NAFTA shows a much different story.

Before NAFTA, the United States had a trade surplus of nearly \$2 billion with Mexico. After NAFTA, the surplus has deteriorated to the point where we have a \$16 billion trade deficit. That means they sell us \$16 billion more than we sell them. I want to talk about what they actually sell us because that is kind of a strange figure. I will get to that in just a second.

We do not sell to their middle class because their middle class is eroding. They lost 8 million people in the middle class since NAFTA in Mexico, 8 million people. They used to pay their workers \$1 an hour. They pay them now 70 cents an hour, because there is no collective organization to help workers raise their standards to ours. There is no enforcement of the laws in Mexico to do that. There is no enforcement to keep their environment clean, or at least to clean up their environment.

"How did Europe and Japan fare in Mexico?" my colleagues ask. "Did they get locked out?" The answer is no. In fact, they are doing much better than us. Europe and Japan had a trade surplus with Mexico before NAFTA. But unlike the United States, they have maintained their trade surplus with Mexico, even through the Mexico peso crash in 1994.

On a trip through the maquiladora zone along the United States-Mexican border, we see names like Sony and Samsung along with United States companies. Asia is fully into Mexico today. I do not want history to repeat itself, because we are being given the same warnings about South America.

The truth is that we are doing very well today in South America. Our exports are up 19 percent over last year, without fast track. We have doubled our trade surplus with South America to 3.6 billion without fast track. We are not losing out. We are winning. But if we expand a bad trade deal like NAFTA to South America, I will be willing to bet that South America will go the way of Mexico and, for that matter, Japan and China.

□ 1315

After 4 years of experience with NAFTA the American people certainly are not being fooled by big corporate campaigns to expand NAFTA at this time. In fact they are very much opposed to the President's fast track proposal.

I have a little chart I want to show my colleagues here; it is a poll that was done recently. By a 2 to 1 margin the American people oppose fast track, according to the Wall Street Journal-NBC poll. Most Americans believe that trade deals benefit multinational corporations at the expense of working

families. This figure was taken from a poll done for the Democratic Leadership Council, by the way, which supports fast track. Also by a 2 to 1 margin the American people believe that labor and environmental and human rights issues should be included in trade agreements. Eighty-three percent of Americans say, "What's the rush with fast track?" according to this poll. And, finally, most Americans say that increased imports take away American jobs and hurt the wages of American workers.

So public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to fast track and trade deals done without proper labor and environmental standards because they have looked at the record of NAFTA and they know that it has not worked. You can talk to people. There was a recent study done by the Policy Institute that showed that we have lost 394,000 jobs as a result of NAFTA, net jobs; I am not talking about just jobs, I am talking about net jobs. We have gained some jobs; net total we have lost a huge number of jobs.

I would like for just a second to address one other issue before I yield to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] who has been so fabulous in leading our efforts on this issue, and that is the issue of exports, because the other side like to ballyhoo the number, that we are exporting more to Mexico now, even though they are importing a heck of a lot more here.

Let me tell you something. I want my colleagues to look at a memo that I have from Professor Harley Shaiken, who was at the University of California and who has studied the economic relationship between Mexico and United States extensively. He is probably the foremost expert in the country on this. Professor Shaiken shed some light on what I would call the myth behind our increased exports to Mexico.

There is no denying that exports to Mexico have risen since NAFTA although imports, as I said, have increased much more dramatically. But Professor Shaiken, analyzing trade data, shows that the vast majority of exports growth has been in what he calls revolving door exports or industrial tourists.

Now these are goods that are shipped to Mexico as components, usually along the border with the United States and the maquiladora, therefore counted as exports but then assembled in Mexico and shipped right back here. That is why they call them tourist exports. They are not even there long enough to have a visa. They get shipped over there, they are put together by people who make 70 cents an hour, and they are shipped right back here, not to consumers in Mexico, as I said before. The consumer middle class in Mexico has declined by about 8 million people in the last 4 years.

Revolving door exports have surged 230 percent since NAFTA, rising from 18 billion in 1993 to 42 billion last year.

These exports accounted for 40 percent of our total exports to Mexico in 1993, but that share grew up to 62 percent last year.

So the upshot is, 62 percent of our exports to Mexico are shipped right back here, and these are not job-creating exports, they are job-destroying exports.

Professor Shaiken notes in his memos, paraphrasing Pogo, "We have met the market, and it is us."

You know, there are so many aspects to this issue. There is a food safety issue, there is the drug issue, there is the loss of jobs, the downward pressure on wages, there is the environmental degradation.

I visited maquiladora in Tijuana with my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and we have some stories and some pictures that I am sure my colleague will show you right now from his recent visit to the border that really, for me, sickens my stomach that our corporations and our Government have not dealt with these questions of worker safety and worker rights and environmental degradation, and I think you will understand why when you hear the distinguished leader. So I am honored that he would join me this afternoon in talking about this issue that is so fundamental to the values which we hold so dear and which so many people have fought for in this country for so many years, and I thank him for joining, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I will come to the well because I have some pictures I would like to show.

First, I would like to salute the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished whip on the Democratic side. No one has a greater understanding of the challenges that face working families in America than he does, and no one has fought harder to realize the interests of working families than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. So I am always deeply pleased to be with him in talking about these important issues.

Let me start today by saying right off the bat that I am for free trade, as is the gentleman from Michigan. We believe trade is synergistic, we think it has energy for everyone, we think it helps every country that can engage in free trade, and we are for free trade treaties between the United States and other countries and within the whole world. We also believe that trade should be fair as well as free, that it is not just enough to get tariffs down, that there are other issues that need to be dealt with when you are talking about a trading relationship.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1980's we advocated that there be access to foreign markets like Japan so that we could get our products into their market as easily as they could get their products into our market, and through the 1980's and into the early 1990's we were able to get those access issues to be debated, to be understood and, I think, to

be accepted by people in the United States and across the world.

Since the early 1990's, when the real debate began on the North American Free Trade Agreement, we brought up the issue of fairness as it applied to the proper application and administration of labor laws, worker laws and environmental laws in other countries, and that is because when we talk about the NAFTA, it was to be a free trade agreement between two countries that were highly developed economically and another country that was still in the early stages of development with a much lower standard of living, and we realized that if trade was to work for everybody in Canada, the United States and Mexico, it was very important that there be a greater effort at the application of national laws on labor and on environment.

Now why is that the case? That is the case because the standards we have in these areas need to be moving toward uniformity, not toward disappearing, because if you have no standards, then the lack of standards becomes a comparative advantage for the country that has no standards. Plus the fact I just do not see how anybody says we should not try to get the laws of other countries we are trading with to be properly enforced.

So as a result of that we wrote language into the so-called fast track negotiating authority that said we would pay attention to these issues, and in the negotiation, for the first time in the negotiation of any free trade agreement we had serious discussions of how we could get the national laws of each country on labor and the environment to be properly enforced.

Now at the end of the day we were not able to get that enforcement process to have real teeth. These issues wound up in so-called side agreements that I felt were largely cosmetic, and that is the reason I oppose the NAFTA agreement, because there was not a serious attempt to really enforce these laws.

Now, right now, the President is asking us for fast track negotiating authority to get new free trade agreements with, say, Brazil or Argentina or Chile or other countries across the world, and just as in 1991, I voted for fast track for then-President Bush, I am quite prepared to vote for fast track for President Clinton because obviously I think he shares my values on these issues much more than President Bush did, but I do not want again to go to a set of negotiations without the Congress being very clear about what we expect in macro terms to be in these agreements. I did that once; I do not want to do that again. I think we suffered as a Congress from giving this fast track authority, which of course gives tremendous power from the Congress to the executive branch, which I am willing to give because I understand the nature of trade negotiations, but I am not willing to give it without some overall admonition about what we expect to have in these treaties.

I do not want to mislead anyone. I do not want the Brazilians to be misled as to what we will require in the Congress in these treaties. We want labor and environmental enforcement of their laws in the core trade treaty with trade sanctions in order to enforce it.

Now when I say that a lot of people say, "Well, how can you ask another country to enforce its laws?" Why would we not ask another country to enforce its laws? How could we possibly enter into a free trade marriage, which is what a free trade agreement is, without making sure that all the countries involved were going to enforce their national laws?

Now let me go a step further. Before we negotiated the NAFTA, our business community said that you have got to insist that Mexico change and improve its intellectual property laws, and we went to Mexico and did that. Mexico changed and improved its intellectual property and capital laws, and we put those laws into the treaty and said that if Mexico does not properly enforce their intellectual property and capital laws, we will bring trade sanctions against their products coming into the United States. And what I say to my friends in the business community is if it is good enough for intellectual property and capital, which we all care about, surely it must be good enough for labor and the environment.

I just want symmetry. I want us to treat labor and environment as strongly as we treat intellectual property and capital.

Now, having said all of that, I think as we enter this debate it is important to understand what has happened with NAFTA. Some people are saying, oh, you cannot look at NAFTA, that is unfair because no country is alike. I agree with that, no country is alike. But surely it is relevant to this debate to say we have done a free trade treaty with a country that is in a state of development. What has happened there with that free trade treaty? Has it worked the way we had hoped it would work?

And so let us get out some facts about what is happened with NAFTA. The first thing you need to understand is that since 1993 the number of jobs and the number of factories on the border in Mexico has doubled since 1993. In 1993 there were about 500,000 jobs on the border; now there is almost 1 million.

You also need to understand that the turnover rate in those plants is 100 percent. The people work for less here, and they move on. Why do they move on so quickly? There is a simple reason. Wages in the maquiladora plants in Mexico have gone down in the last 3 years, not up. They were \$1 an hour; now people are paid 70 cents an hour. As a result, people cannot live on that wage so they leave. They either come to the United States or they go back to the interior where they grew up in Mexico.

Now, as a result of that it has been really difficult to get enforcement of

Mexico's labor and environmental laws which might have moved things in a better direction. You know if we really had gotten Mexico's labor laws to be more properly enforced, maybe wages would be \$1.25 an hour rather than 70 cents an hour as they are now. But that has not happened. Four cases have been brought under the labor side agreement, and none of them have been resolved. Under the North American Development Bank, which we set up to remedy some of these environment conditions, only 3 loans have been let and none of them have been completed, and there are literally hundreds of situations on the border where there is real environmental danger to the people living on the border.

Now I recently went to the border again, to Juarez, across the line from El Paso, and I have here some pictures that I think best present what is actually happening on the border. You know, one of the things we need to do as we go into this debate is have a reality check, what is actually happening with the free trade treaty.

Here is a picture of a brand new, very modern maquiladora plant, and maybe hard to see over the television, but I think people in the room here can see this is a maquiladora plant.

□ 1330

It is a modern plant, I forget which company it was, one of our major corporations. What you need to understand is the maquiladora plants in places like Mexico are high tech, high quality, high productivity, making the most sophisticated products in the world, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out. This is not low tech, old world technology. This is the best plant you will find in the world.

But across a drainage ditch a few yards from that plant is the housing where the people who work in the plant live. The housing is literally made from the pallets and the boxes that come from the plant. The people live on the ground. They are earning between \$24 and \$32 a week for 8 and 10 hours of work a day. That is a picture of where they live.

The next picture is a picture of the drainage ditch, which is behind me. In this picture is the maquiladora, a few yards is the drainage ditch. This is filled with pollution, human waste, the smell here was overpowering, the amount of pollution in this ditch was overpowering. This ditch is a hazard to people's health, hepatitis, cholera. And here are the houses that the people live in. These are pallets, and the people earn probably \$24 to \$32.

Here is another picture of the houses. Here is a young boy up on top trying to make repairs in the roof of their house. As I talked to people who are over here, they talked about not having enough food to eat, about the children not being able to go to school because they could not afford to send them to school. They could not afford the clothes. They could not afford the sup-

plies. They said that they have school teachers paid by the government, but not buildings or supplies. So to even go to the public schools, you had to have money. So about half the kids are not attending school.

Here is a picture of washing machine boxes that came straight out of the plant that is behind where these are, and people are living in housing that is literally the packing boxes of the products they are making.

Finally, here is one of the children that we saw in the colonias. The children, as all children are, are beautiful. I talked to one young girl and I asked her her name. She said which name do you want? My right name, or the name I assumed to get a job in the plant at age 13?

Half these children are not in school. All of these children are malnourished. They are living in subhuman conditions. If you go to the maquiladoras and ask our companies why are you allowing people to live in subhuman conditions who are your employees, they probably rightly say because we are in competition with all the other companies that are here, and this is cutthroat competition, and there are no standards.

I want to say something: It is not the responsibility of just the companies to have standards. It is the responsibility of the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico to see that there are human standards for the environment and for people in these factories and in the housing that is around these factories.

It is our responsibility. So do not tell me that human standards and worker standards and environmental standards have no place in a free trade treaty. They have every place in a free trade treaty.

We must be clear if we give this power, as I believe we should, to the President, of what we expect to be in these treaties. It must include worker standards and labor standards and environmental standards that have been passed by the Government of Mexico and endorsed by the Government of the United States.

Finally, if trade is to actually fulfill its purpose, the people in a developing country like Mexico have to make a human wage so they can become consumers of the products they are making. Trade is good, trade is synergistic, trade can raise the standard of living of every country involved. But in order for that to happen, people have to make a living, decent wage. Then we will fulfill the promise of trade. Then trade will be good for every human being on Earth.

This is our leadership mission. The old debate about protectionism and free trade is over. No one advocates protectionism. The issue today in trade is how do we get human standards and decency into the trading relationship between every country in the world. We can do this. This must be our mission, of leadership of the world, so that

conditions like this for this young lady will not exist anywhere in the world.

We can do this. This is our leadership mission. Bobby Kennedy said some see things as they are and ask why; I dream things that never were and ask why not.

In this NAFTA, we must ask, in this fast track we must ask, why not? Better conditions for all of the people of the world, so that capitalism and democracy become the hallmark for everybody in the world that everybody wants to reach for.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his eloquent, impassioned, and thorough description of this trade dilemma that we face. I would like to also yield at this time to another champion who cares about these values and these issues, my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, who has been a leader on these issues and who particularly on the food safety issue has really highlighted the deficiencies in these agreements.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] mentioned and said so passionately and eloquently, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has talked about for years in this institution, in this body, we have seen these trade agreements, whether it is GATT, whether it is NAFTA, other trade agreements we have signed, have seen a diminishing of standards, of clean air and safe drinking water and pure food standards around the world. And that is what is particularly troubling about extending NAFTA to Chile, or any other country in Latin America, as a result of the fast track proposal by the President and by the Republican leadership.

Fast track will accelerate the dismantling that we have worked so hard to build a consensus around, clean air, safe drinking water, pure, safe food. We simply should not give up on the consensus that we have built in this country.

If you go back 90 years ago in the United States, we did not have the kind of protections of our food supply. There was a book written by a 28-year-old journalist by the name of Upton Sinclair called "The Jungle," written about the Chicago packing yards in 1906. When that book was written, America did not really have safeguards in place for beef and poultry and fish and fruits and vegetables. And over time, with the establishment of the Food and Drug Administration, in part coming out of the book "The Jungle" and the scandal that Upton Sinclair pointed out, we as a nation have moved together and built a consensus around these clean air, safe drinking water laws, worker safety laws, pure food laws. And it is something that 95 percent, at least, of the people of this country I believe agree with that consensus.

Yesterday, I think people spoke in this body, particularly loud and clear,

when there was overwhelming support, almost literally every single Democrat in this party and a majority of the Republicans supported the Sanders amendment, which will send I believe U.S. trade negotiators a clear signal that Congress cares deeply about the fundamental precepts of American sovereignty in the new global economy.

Let me outline on the time of the gentleman from Michigan, on what exactly that means and the kind of erosion that we have begun to see in some of the laws that have protected our way of life, clean air, safe drinking water, worker safety laws, all of these things, what some of the threats to that sovereignty and that body of laws that has kept our standard of living and protected our people the way that they have.

The World Trade Organization was created by the GATT agreement that passed Congress about 3 years ago. The World Trade Organization is sort of an international United Nations of international commerce, if you will, except in a lot of ways it has more teeth. Let me run through a couple of examples of what has happened under the GATT, under the World Trade Organization.

Venezuela, which was defending its state-owned monopoly, attacked the United States in the World Trade Organization over provisions of the Clean Air Act. The Venezuelans said America's environmental laws were too strong and kept out Venezuelan oil. Venezuela went to the World Trade Organization, they won, causing a weakening of American environmental laws.

Second example, the Massachusetts State government passed a bill in the legislature that said it would no longer do business with the military government of Myanmar, what used to be called Burma, as a protest against human rights violations, some of the worst of any nation on Earth. The European Union, along with the military dictatorship in Myanmar, in Burma, challenged the right of the State of Massachusetts to make such a law and said it was a barrier to trade. That is now being considered by the World Trade Organization.

The third is closer to home and more directly related to what Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GEPHARDT were talking about. And that is a dispute we are in the middle of with the Government of Chile. Chile has, in the eyes of a lot of Americans, been dumping salmon. They are a major, major world exporter of salmon. They have been dumping salmon in the U.S. market. That means selling salmon at a price less than it cost to produce it, less than the market value, in fact less than the cost to produce it.

American salmon farmers and salmon fishermen, mostly in Maine, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California, have said this is not fair, that they can dump salmon at less than cost and undercut American salmon fishermen and salmon farmers and ultimately take the market away from these businesses

and take jobs away from American workers.

The Government of Chile, in bringing this lawsuit against the United States, is about to, if they lose, which they have lost first round, is about to go in front of the World Trade Organization and ask for it to be declared an unfair trade practice, what the United States is trying to do to even the playing field.

The Chilean Government has hired former Senator and former Presidential candidate and former Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole to represent them. Only 10 months after he was asking the American people to vote for him for President, the Government of Chile has hired Bob Dole to represent them against the United States of America. I think it only begs the question. We wish Mr. Dole played on our team, on the home team, rather than playing on Chile's team, rather than playing on the visitor's team.

What is important is Senator Dole is representing a foreign government against the United States, which ultimately will hurt American businesses and will cost American jobs if Senator Dole and the Chilean Government are successful.

Those are the kinds of things, whether it is weakening environmental laws because of what Venezuela's Government has done, whether it is getting rid of laws that the State of Massachusetts legislature passed, or whether it is costing American jobs and hurting American businesses when Senator Dole represents Chile against the United States. Those are the kinds of things that are happening that will happen and continue to happen and happen in much greater frequency under these provisions in the fast track agreement.

We cannot continue to lower American standards on the environment, on safe drinking water, on clean air. We cannot continue to allow other businesses in other countries and other governments to try to weaken America's food safety laws.

We have seen, as the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, a colleague of Mr. BONIOR's, and I earlier this week had a news conference, talking about the issues of food safety. A young woman from Michigan who had seen her daughter get sick from hepatitis A from strawberries brought in from Mexico in school lunches in Marshall, MI, southwest Michigan, came and spoke at our news conference. She reiterated what a problem it is we do not do the right kind of food inspection at the Mexican-American border, and how America is beginning, because of some of these trade agreements, to lower our standards of food safety.

Few things are more important to this country than to continue to preserve and protect the world's safest, best, and least expensive food supply that we so proudly as a nation have built.

□ 1345

We have no business allowing these trade agreements to override what we have done in our States and cities and what this Federal Government has done to protect our air, protect our water, and protect our food supply.

So I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his involvement and what he has done in leading the charge on making sure that our trade laws are written fairly so that American workers have a fair shake, so it is not costing us jobs and hurting our quality of life.

I asked the question, as many have asked over and over, why should we rush headlong into another trade agreement that endangers America's food supply and costs American jobs until we fix those trade agreements, like NAFTA, that we have not yet fixed. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his wonderful description of a variety of problems, the sovereignty issue, as well as the food safety issue.

I just want to take a second to talk about another aspect of this that I think deserves some attention, and that is the whole question of workers, American workers, Mexican workers, Canadian workers.

We have seen enormous prosperity for the people at the very top in all three countries over the last 10 years. In the United States, that actually goes beyond the very top; it extends probably down to the people who make salaries that are in the top 20 to 25 percent in this country have done quite well. But 80 percent of Americans since 1979 have basically had their wages frozen or have declined in real wage terms.

In Mexico wages have fallen rapidly since NAFTA. Real wages and productivity in Mexico, manufacturing in 1993 to 1996 are illustrated here, and as we can see, the red line is productivity. That means how much more output, how much more productive they have been, and we can see there has been steady growth in productivity during NAFTA in Mexico, but the wages of the workers have gone down. We talked about how they were making \$1 an hour. They are making 70 cents an hour, many of them children, many of them 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 years of age.

So in Mexico, clearly, as I mentioned earlier, 8 million middle-class Mexican families dropped into poverty. Average workers are not benefiting. In fact, they are being hurt by these trade agreements, and I can say the same in Canada as well where wage stagnation for most of the workers has occurred. People at the top are doing extremely well. The top 1 percent are doing fabulously well.

So what we are asking for is that everybody gets to share in this pie. Historically, the way workers have increased their share has been to collectively organize and bargain for a better

deal, for better wages, for better health care, for a secure pension, and all of the things that tend to make life fun, tend to make life bearable, tend to make life possible for a family. These things just did not happen; they happened in America because people came together and demanded them collectively.

I remember in the 1950's, almost 40 percent of American families were members of labor unions, and that was, of course, the greatest period in America where we had growth of average families. Productivity was ranging at about 90, 95 percent, and so wages and benefits were at 90, 95 percent. And as membership in organized labor bodies dropped through the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's, to the point where it is about 15 or 14 percent today, wages relative to productivity dropped was well to the point where, as I mentioned, since 1979 workers basically are losing ground or have not gained anything at all. That is a long time; it is almost 20 years.

So when we argue on behalf of Mexican workers being able to organize, to assemble freely, to form unions that will work for them and their families, we do that, we argue that not only for those Mexican workers, but we argue it for our workers here.

Now, people say, well, how does that affect our workers here? It affects them because if Mexican wages and benefits start to increase, as they did here in the 1940's and 1950's and 1960's, then the employers cannot play this game with workers and say, if you do not take a cut here or a freeze here, we are going south, because, after all, Mexico is basically economically a 51st State in the United States. We have just gotten rid of all of the economic barriers. It is right across the border.

I had the occasion a few months ago to talk with some women who came to see me, who were from El Paso, TX, a town, which I might add, was supposed to be reaping the most benefits, we were told during the NAFTA debate, from NAFTA, because it was on the border. There would be a lot of commerce, there would be a lot of energy, there would be a lot of jobs created. Well, El Paso has one of the highest unemployment rates of a major city in the country today.

These women came and they told me they worked at a textile facility; most of these women were in their forties or early fifties, some single parents. They had been working at this facility for many years, sewing, making a little above the minimum wage. The minimum wage was \$4.75 back then; it is now \$5.15. They were making \$5 and \$6. They all lost their jobs because their company moved right across the border, not very much more than 3 or 4 miles away, set up shop, and was able to pay Mexican workers, I suspect some of them probably children, 70 cents an hour.

When these women, who were displaced after years of service to this

company, went to the Government, our Government which advocated NAFTA and said, if we have displaced workers, we will help them with job relocation and job retraining, when they went to their government to get that promise, it was not there. None of them were helped; did not have a program for them, could not take care of them. So they came to see me and talk to me about this.

It is broken promises of NAFTA that are causing a lot of people to reconsider what they did on that vote in this Chamber.

I think the thing that moves me the most about this is that I wish the President and I wish all of my colleagues, for that matter the American people who are interested in this issue, as most should be, would have a chance to go down and see what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] showed in the pictures. One has to see it to believe it. It is disgraceful. People are living on the border in subhuman conditions, in cardboard boxes made out of the very containers that they put together in facilities that they work in. When they struggle to have an independent voice, to collectively form a union to increase their ability to bargain with these multinational corporations, or not multinational, regular business leaders, they are prohibited from doing so.

I visited a colonia in Tijuana and talked with a group of people who lived in a similar situation that Mr. GEPHARDT described in Juarez, and the leader of the colonia told me and Mr. GEPHARDT and others that the plant that they worked in accelerated the speed of the line so they could get more production, and as a result, people that he worked with who lived in his colonia, his village, were losing fingers and some hands, and it was intolerable. These things were happening on a regular basis.

So they decided, because they were not getting any action from this company, that they would protest, so they stopped working. And he, as the leader of the group, was fired from his job. He then tried to form an independent union and ended up being thrown in jail for trying to organize a union to deal with this scandalous situation.

It reminds me, and it should remind my colleagues, if we remember our history, of what happened in this country 100 years ago. We maybe do not even have to go back that far; 60, 70 years ago.

So when I say that these trade agreements are taking us backward to those conditions, that is what I am talking about, because the Government of Mexico, the multinationals that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] talked about, they are not doing anything to change this. So what we want to do in these trade agreements is to force them to do something, like we forced them to do something here over the course of this past century. Force

them to do things that would help develop the strongest, most viable, economically vibrant middle class that the world has ever seen.

So this is a struggle, and it is not easy, because we are up against some of the wealthiest, most powerful people in the world and governments in the world. But we are right. I am not always right, but on this I feel it not only in my head, but I feel it in my gut and my heart, and it is going to happen. It is just a matter of when and how long and how many kids are going to have to be sacrificed in the meantime by not getting an education, by being worked to death. How much of our environment is going to get spoiled? How many of our people here are going to lose their jobs? And how much disillusionment is going to be created with the 70 percent in America and the 95 percent in Mexico, or the 70 percent in Canada who are trying to make a go of it each and every single day, and who remember the sacrifices of their families and their mothers and their fathers and their grandparents to get them to where they were.

Those folks need to join the battle, because when they are aligned together, there is just too many of us, and we will win, because history is on our side, right is on our side, economic right is on our side.

I want to yield now to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has been also one of the great champions on protecting average working people and especially the environment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for all of the work that he has done in opposition to the fast track legislation and the way that it has been handled so far.

I know that one of the concerns that the gentleman mentioned, too, and I was listening, is the need to protect the environment as well as the health and safety of American families. One of the concerns that I have had is that so far we are hearing mainly the suggestion that there would be additional environmental side agreements, that somehow the environment would be addressed in further trade agreements with other countries in the same way that it was with NAFTA as a side agreement to the initial treaty, and my concern is that that does not adequately protect the environment, that that is not the way to go about it.

In fact, what we have learned is that in the case of NAFTA, the environmental side agreement, if you will, has basically resulted in the number of factories along this very heavily-polluted United States-Mexican border, the number of factories has actually increased by 20 percent, so pollution problems are getting worse.

Also, little is being done to ensure that new facilities are complying with environmental standards. Something like 44 tons of hazardous waste that is illegally dumped by these border fac-

ories every day are not being cleaned up. In fact, there was a commitment to spend, I think, as much as \$2 billion to do cleanup along the border, and none of that money has been spent.

Mr. BONIOR. That is right. That was the promise of NAFTA: We will spend \$2 billion and clean it up. They spent less than 1 percent of that money, and virtually nothing has been done. There are a few projects underway right now, but virtually nothing has been done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, what I think that the administration is telling us now is that they are willing to put negotiating objectives in the fast track legislation that would include specific references to the environment. But I do not believe that that is going to accomplish our goal because that will not require that environmental agreements actually be included as part of the treaties that we negotiate.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has been such a champion on this, and I thank the Chair for his indulgence, and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it's been 4 years since NAFTA was signed. And for those 4 years it's been nothing but bad news: NAFTA has been bad news for American workers; NAFTA's been bad news for Mexican workers; and NAFTA's been bad news for the environment.

American workers have lost 420,000 jobs thanks to NAFTA and Mexican workers' wages have dropped to one-third of what they were in 1980—from \$2.40 an hour in 1993 to \$1.50 in 1996.

So, Mr. Speaker if NAFTA is such a dismal failure? If NAFTA has hurt so many workers on both sides of the border, why on Earth are we talking about repeating its mistakes?

Thanks to NAFTA hundreds of American companies have closed shop in the United States only to reopen in Mexico to take advantage of cheaper labor and weaker worker protections.

And some of those corporations that don't shift their businesses south threaten to move in order to stop union organizing. They tell their workers if they try to organize the company will move south to Mexico and they'll be out on the streets.

Meanwhile, those companies that move to Mexico are having horrible effects on the environment. Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT just returned from the border where the pollution and disease are unbelievable.

In the border region, where maquiladora plants have been set up to do business cheaply, corporations pollute at will, with no control from the Mexican Government. Dozens of medical reports describe increased disease rates, child deformity, and infant mortality rates caused by the lack of environmental control.

On the American side of the border with Mexico, hepatitis rates have risen to about four times the United States average. Mr. Speaker, hepatitis does not respect borders. Instances of tuberculosis are higher since the passage of NAFTA as well.

Companies who conduct business in Mexico are free to spew toxic wastes into the rivers and filthy pollutants into the air.

And Mr. Speaker, that air and that water does not stop at the Texas border just because it's the United States. This Congress and our President should be doing everything possible to protect our citizens. Not selling them out for free trade at any price.

Back when we first debated NAFTA, I remember people arguing that this agreement would help to create prosperity for Mexican workers.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, those people were wrong. The Mexican workers are actually worse off now than they were before. Democratic Leader GEPHARDT brought back pictures of families living in packing boxes used to ship the products they make.

And, Mexican wages aren't just dropping because of market forces. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican Government actually implemented policies to keep Mexican wages down to attract foreign investment. It is no surprise that Mexicans aren't able to buy our products—most of them have trouble putting food on the table.

Thanks to depressed Mexican wages and dangerous, unhealthy workplaces, our trade deficit with Mexico is worse than ever. In other words, we buy their products much more than they buy ours.

In 1993, prior to the passage of NAFTA, the United States actually had a trade surplus with Mexico of \$1.7 billion.

Today, we all know that this healthy surplus has collapsed into a deficit of \$16.2 billion. Mr. Speaker—under any circumstances, I would call a \$16.2 billion trade deficit bad news for our economy and I would call the agreement that led to that deficit a bad idea. Yet President Clinton and some of my colleagues want to use that agreement as a model for others.

The agreement that brought this country from a trade surplus to a trade deficit in only 4 years is going to be used again?

So Mr. Speaker, now that we know that NAFTA has hurt our workers, failed to protect the environment, hurt the lives of Mexicans, and hurt the American economy, I think we should talk about ways to fix its mistakes, not ways to repeat them.

But the administration disagrees with me, they are proposing Fast Track Trade Negotiating Authority, which has no protections for worker's rights, no protection for the environment, and nothing remotely resembling human rights.

During NAFTA, these elements were negotiated in side-agreements, which were not enforced.

Now, 4 years later, the evidence is clear, the side agreements didn't work. Any environmental or worker protections need to be included in the body of the agreement itself, not as some sort of toothless afterthought, as the administration would have it.

Unfortunately, these important standards are only included as "objectives" for our negotiators. Section 2, part C states that "U.S. negotiators shall take into account U.S. domestic objectives including, but not limited to, the protection of health and safety, essential security, environmental * * *", and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, these are excellent goals and our negotiators should certainly keep them in mind. But this doesn't provide any sort of guarantees that these initiatives will be taken care of. This legislation does not force negotiators to make changes in workers' rights; the legislation does not require any deals on environmental protection or human rights either.

And it does not hold governments accountable for the mistreatment of their workers and the abuse of their environment.

I know that the people who support the proposal say that section 2 allocates worker rights and environmental protection to the World Trade Organization. But, Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the World Trade Organization has refused to take on these issues.

In fact, in order to achieve enforceable standards for workers and the environment, 131 countries would have to reach a consensus and we all know that is never going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that NAFTA has been a terrible failure and we know many of the reasons why. I hope that the administration will give history its due and learn from their mistakes instead of repeating them.

Instead, we should learn from failures of NAFTA and work to build a new plan for negotiating trade agreements.

□ 1400

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RELATING TO FAST TRACK LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to continue with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] along the same lines. Even though this may sound a little bureaucratic, it is important.

If we look at the proposed legislation, it says it will ensure that trade and environmental protection are mutually supportive, and it in fact even serves to limit consideration of the environment to foreign government policies and practices regarding the environment that are directly related to trade. It limits the ability of the United States to deal with environmental issues by requiring that negotiations take place through the World Trade Organization.

My point is that if we look at the language of what is being proposed, not only does it not adequately protect the environment and guarantee that the environment is addressed directly in these subsequent agreements that are negotiated, but it may even limit the ability to do that. So it does not in any way satisfy our concerns.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has read that correctly. This fast track authority that has been submitted by the administration, I contend, is weaker on the environment and weaker on labor standards than the one that was negotiated under NAFTA 4 years ago.

I think these issues on the environment the gentleman talked about need to be in the core agreement, with enforceable standards, like we enforce capital and as we enforce intellectual property. It falls far, far short of what is necessary. That is why major envi-

ronmental groups throughout this country are opposing this fast track, because they see it as opening the flood gates and continuing the environmental degradation that we have seen.

Mr. PALLONE. What I have been doing over the last couple of days, Mr. Chairman, is I have put together a letter that I am trying, and some Members have already signed and I am trying to get more Members to sign, to the President basically saying this: That it is critical for the fast track to require that environmental concerns be directly addressed in negotiated agreements, rather than allowing environmental protection to be negotiated separately in unenforceable side agreements that do not adequately protect the environment.

To that end, trade agreements negotiated under fast track should also be negotiated to include enforcement mechanisms that should hold governments to set environmental protection. I am not saying even with that that fast track is acceptable, but I believe very strongly that if we were able to get these kinds of inclusions in there, at least we would have a little better protection and know that something would be done on the environment other than negotiating additional side agreements that really have had no impact.

One of the things I keep saying over and over again is we have to look at NAFTA as the example. I know a lot of people say, well, in voting or in reviewing fast track legislation, we should not look back at NAFTA. To me that makes no sense. NAFTA is the example that we have of what may result as a result of fast track. If the environment did not work with that, why should we believe it is going to work again?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I found it quite interesting that when the President came before our caucus in this very building a couple of weeks ago, he mentioned on at least on two occasions, maybe three, when he was talking to us, he said off the cuff, and I could see his aides wincing in the background, and he said, "Well, if you were not for NAFTA, you probably will not want to be for fast track."

There was a reason that people will not be for fast track; because NAFTA has been, as we have said, it has been deficient in all of these areas. That is why on our side of the aisle there may be upward of 20 Members who voted for NAFTA who will be voting against fast track because it has not delivered. That is why the President has mentioned on several occasions, and I think maybe not inadvertently, but I think he would not do it again if he had to, that if Members voted against NAFTA they would probably vote against fast track.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate that. If I could just say one last thing, that is that the reason I feel so strongly about this is not only because I think it is important to have better environ-

mental standards in the other countries, but also because if we do not, if we just allow these free trade agreements to go forward without these kinds of environmental safeguards, then what happens is ultimately our own environmental standards are threatened, because it becomes very easy for those countries to lure plants and companies, manufacturing, down to, say, Mexico.

Mr. BONIOR. That is exactly what happened to the furniture industry in southern California. It has gone over the border into Mexico because they do not have to comply with environmental laws and rules. I visited an acid factory in Tijuana, an acid field that was supposed to recycle batteries, and it was a field probably the size of this room, filled with acid. And right across the street, not more than 10 yards away, was the largest dairy farm in that state, huge. And of course, the obvious problems occurred. The children who were drinking the milk from those cows were suffering and having serious health problems. It boggles the mind to think that we are not only allowing this to occur, but we have done nothing at all to correct it in this new legislation. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

INQUIRIES TO THE ADMINISTRATION REGARDING CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL TO LIBYA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Libya is a rogue nation that openly supports, promotes, and inspires terrorist activities around the world. None of us could ever forget Libya's involvement in the 1985 terrorist attacks in Rome and Vienna airports that killed 20 men, women, and children, including five Americans. Nor can we forget Libya's responsibility for the 1986 bombing in Berlin that killed two United States servicemen. And of course, we will never, ever forget Libya's dastardly involvement in the 1988 bombing of Pan Am flight 103 which resulted in killing 270 men, women, and children, including 189 Americans.

Because of these and other acts of terrorism, Mr. Speaker, Libya has been sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, and United States law imposes serious limitations on the ability of our citizens to travel to Libya or to spend money there.

The State Department has reported that one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] recently traveled to Libya without official authorization or approval. Against that background, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] has prepared a privileged resolution that would direct the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to undertake an immediate and thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding the travel of