

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

[Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IMPRISONED CHINESE PASTOR XU

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, now and then an occasion will occur to shatter our complacency, stir our indignation and seize us with outrage. Too often we take our priceless freedoms in America for granted, but a recent event in China symbolizes the stark contrast between liberty and tyranny.

On September 25, a court in China sentenced Pastor Xu Yongze to 10 years in prison. Pastor Xu, the leader of a movement of more than 3 million Christians in China, was charged with the so-called crime of disrupting public order.

Mr. Speaker, this charge would be laughable were it not so cruel. Pastor Xu is often described as the Billy Graham of China, and he is one of the most well known and widely respected pastors in China.

The Communist authorities first arrested him back in March and engaged in a vicious smear campaign. Their propaganda described Pastor Xu as an evil cult abettor who plays evil tricks on his parishioners. In reality Pastor Xu is a sincere, devout believer who only seeks to serve his Lord and spread the gospel. We have seen this so many times in Communist countries, whether it be Cuba or Nicaragua or Russia, but it is particularly gruesome in China.

Persecution and imprisonment are nothing new for Pastor Xu. In 1988, on the day before he was scheduled to meet with Dr. Billy Graham in China, Pastor Xu was arrested and spent the next three years in prison. Following his release, he courageously resumed his ministry activities.

Reliable reports indicate that Pastor Xu has been beaten and tortured while in prison, and from what we know of the heinous conditions in China's prison labor camps, I fear that his treatment may only worsen.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in a comprehensive, balanced and sophisticated approach in American policy towards China. I believe in trade engagement, a patient dialogue with China. But I also believe in liberty and justice. The time has come to speak out with force against China's outrageous assault on Pastor Xu, human dignity and religious freedom. The values that America stands for and my own conscience demand nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that my words today may upset some members of the Chinese government. Let me tell my colleagues, I do not care. Let me

remind them that I and many others in America have been very patient, and our patience has worn thin, worn very thin.

In May, I quietly wrote to the Chinese Ambassador to politely express my concern over Pastor Xu's arrest. He remained in prison. In June, I led a bipartisan coalition of 44 of my colleagues in writing to President Jiang Zemin, further politely expressing our concern about Pastor Xu. Again, he remained in prison, and we never even received the courtesy of a reply.

In July, August and September, I sponsored and encouraged quiet discussions with Chinese officials about Pastor Xu's situation. Not only did Pastor Xu remain in prison, but the Chinese regime has now given him a 10-year sentence, which I am told is the harshest sentence handed down to a Christian in China since 1982.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, President Jiang Zemin will be arriving in the United States in just a few weeks. I really look forward to the Chinese President's visit. I believe it presents me with an opportunity for dialogue, strong dialogue, and cooperation on issues of mutual interest and concern to the United States and to China.

But I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am so upset and puzzled by this horrific sentence on such contrived charges that were given to Pastor Xu. Such brazen disregard for American concerns causes me to question China's commitment to a positive, constructive relationship with the United States. As China modernizes its economy, refines its political system and seeks to fully participate in the marketplace of nations, I frankly do not understand why its leadership continues to insist on persecuting innocent people of faith.

I guarantee my colleagues, I personally will make sure that President Zemin's trip here to the United States will not be a happy one.

So, Mr. Speaker, China finds itself at a crossroads. Pastor Xu has been sentenced, but reports indicate that his case may come up for appeal. On the eve of President Jiang Zemin's visit, I believe that the Chinese government has a valuable opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to the rule of law and to positive relations with the United States.

As Pastor Xu's case comes up for review, I believe it would be a very meaningful gesture if the Chinese government were to guarantee that Pastor Xu's constitutional rights are respected, that his personal welfare is ensured, and his situation is favorably resolved.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by simply quoting an earnest plea from Pastor Xu's son:

Dear friends, I hope that you can help my father. For God and for the church he has sacrificed all that he had. The church in China needs him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CRAPO addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BREAST CANCER LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCINTYRE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to address an issue of extreme importance to all women in American society, breast cancer. As the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women, breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among American women. The impact of this disease cannot be overstated. This year alone over 180,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and 43,000 will die from it.

In a nationwide attempt to raise awareness about this problem, this deadly disease, the month of October has been designated as Breast Cancer Awareness Month. And October 17, next week, has been named National Mammography Day in an effort to encourage women to get mammograms and to make sure that they are joined in the fight against this deadly disease.

□ 1845

I am joining many of my colleagues in the House, both here in Washington and other concerned citizens back home in southeastern North Carolina, in making sure that National Breast Cancer Awareness Month and National Mammography Day are used as an opportunity to push for the consideration of two bills that have been pending for too long here in this Congress. It is time for these bills to come out of committee, it is time for this Congress to take a stand in fighting a deadly disease that day in and day out is taking the lives of too many women, young, middle aged and old, in our society.

The Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act would end the practice of drive-through mastectomies, and the Reconstructive Breast Surgery Benefits Act would require health insurance companies to provide coverage for reconstructive breast surgery resulting from mastectomies.

Finding a cure for breast cancer is essential, but until it arrives we must address the vital importance of early detection, treatment and recovery from this deadly killer. It is time to take action, it is time to stop the talk and to get on with the walk to walk toward a recovery of this dreaded disease and do all that we can to get these bills out of committee and on this floor and voted on so that our women in this Nation can receive the help they need against this deadly killer. We can and should demand no less.

FAST TRACK LEGISLATION AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICA'S TRADE AGREEMENTS

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 on fast track legislation this evening, let me congratulate the Fighting Elephants in their victory over the Dunking Donkeys last night in the congressional basketball game. It is a biannual game that we have at Galaudet University, which is the national university for the deaf and hearing impaired. We raise money for that school, and we thank all those on the staff of the Congress and Members who came out. We had over 40 Members participate.

We also thank the Speaker for his participation and for the singing of the National Anthem with the Capital Four. It was a wonderful part of the evening.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about fast track. Last spring a little girl from Michigan, named Lindsay Doneth, was rushed to a hospital with a fever of 103. Her lips were bleeding, she was nauseous and she had sharp pains. As Lindsay screamed in agony, her mom and dad sat by her hospital bed unsure whether their 10-year-old would live or die.

Doctors said Lindsay had contracted hepatitis, a potentially deadly blood disorder. And she was not alone. Area hospitals were being flooded with her classmates from Madison Elementary School. Fortunately, Lindsay and the other students survived the outbreak. Today she and her classmates are back in class. As it turns out, all 179 of them had eaten contaminated Mexican strawberries in the school cafeteria.

Now, I tell this story today because it relates directly to the most important issue Congress is now debating: Fast track and the future of America's trade agreements.

Now, some might ask, well, what is the connection here? What do Mexican strawberries and sick children in Michigan have to do with our Nation's trade policies? Absolutely everything. Every day some 10,000 Mexican trucks line up in the sweltering heat waiting to cross into the United States, honking their horns as the traffic barely crawls forward. I have seen it down on the border.

Overburdened customs inspectors have to wave most of them through because they only have time to check about 1 percent. They call this the wave line down there. They just send the trucks on through. So how many go without inspection? More than 3 million trucks a year. Three million.

Unfortunately, under the NAFTA agreement that was signed into law almost 4 years ago, it prevents us from increasing inspections at the border. Under section 717 of that agreement,

searching more diligently for pesticides, toxins, parasites and infectious disease could be considered a constraint, or I should say a restraint of trade.

And it is not just tainted food that is slipping into the country. According to the Drug Enforcement Agency, 70 percent of the cocaine entering the United States now rolls across the Mexican border. One former DEA official called NAFTA, and I quote him, a deal made in narco heaven.

Now, I know that some of my colleagues are thinking to themselves and saying, "There goes DAVID BONIOR again, attacking NAFTA." And it is true I have attacked NAFTA over the years, and for good reason, but my remarks this evening are primarily about the future and about how we can avoid repeating the mistakes of the past.

I bring the case of Lindsay Doneth and the contaminated strawberries only because it raises a critical issue in this debate on fast track. Will the trade deals we negotiate promote rising living standards at home and abroad or will they lead to a downward spiral of dangerous food, of dirtier environment, and of lower wages and benefits?

Let me emphasize here that I believe cultivating healthy trade relationships is critical to America's future. But our prosperity will depend not just on the quantity but the quality of that trade. That is why we must negotiate strong and sensible trade agreements.

As an analogy I sometimes compare foreign trade with a wild horse. With a bit between its teeth, the reins in our grasp, and a firm sense of purpose, we can harness the power and ride it where we want it to go. But if we fail to assert ourselves, we run the risk of being thrown and trampled and left behind.

And so I pose the following question: Will our trade deals carry us into the future or drag us into the past?

At stake in this debate is nothing less than the safety of the food we eat, the water we drink and the air that we breathe. At stake in this debate is the safety of our factories, the stability of our farms and the economic security of working families everywhere. And at stake in this debate are the very values that give our economy strength and our democracy meaning.

There are those who denigrate such talk. They dismiss it as mere idealism. Almost derisively they ask, are these issues really related to trade? And without a doubt, the answer is yes. The world has changed, and the people who would segregate health and safety and the environmental issues during trade negotiations fail to grasp the new reality of this global economy.

Those pushing fast track see trade only in two dimensions, like the flat dusty pages of an accountant's ledger. Like those who scoffed at Columbus for claiming the Earth was round, they cling to the old notions that no longer apply to a modern world. With a lot of

talk about the 21st century, they are pulling us back to 19th century conditions: Lower wages, weaker consumer protections, and a dirtier environment. I call that the past masquerading as the future.

Four years ago, when we debated NAFTA, its supporters made some pretty big promises. And today, as we consider fast track negotiations to expand NAFTA to other countries, it is incumbent upon us to review the impact that that agreement has already had. So let us look at it for a second.

In 1993 NAFTA supporters promised that the agreement would generate hundreds of thousands of new jobs. They were wrong. According to the Clinton administration's own assessment, NAFTA-related exports have generated somewhere between 90,000 and 160,000 new jobs. And they quietly say that the agreement has had a modest positive effect on the U.S. economy.

But those figures do not account for nearly 150,000 Americans who lost their jobs as a direct result of the agreement. That figure comes from the Labor Department, and it only includes those workers who received health under NAFTA's narrow trade adjustment assistance program. Other estimates of NAFTA job-related job losses run much, much higher. The Economic Policy Institute issued a report last month that indicated NAFTA has cost nearly 395,000 American jobs.

Whatever the exact figure may be, the Labor Department found, this is our own Government, they found that two-thirds of Americans who lost their jobs due to foreign trade end up with work that pays less than they earned before. Two-thirds of the people. Now, I do not call that progress. I call that slipping backwards.

In 1993, NAFTA supporters promised that the agreements would generate higher wages on both sides of the United States-Mexican border, and they were wrong. Mexican wages along the border dropped from \$1.00 an hour, as abysmal as that is, to 70 cents an hour, according to the International Monetary Fund. And tragically that is despite the fact of a 26-percent increase in Mexican productivity over the past 3 years.

So the Mexican workers are working harder, they are producing more, they are more efficient, things are increasing by 26 percent, and they are getting paid 70 as opposed to a dollar when NAFTA was first established.

All this is putting downward pressure on wages here in the United States, affecting our own workers. Last year a Cornell University study found that 62 percent of U.S. companies have used the threat of shutting their doors or moving abroad to hold down wages and cut back benefits and undermine collective bargaining here at home.

Now, imagine that. Sixty-two percent of our companies go to the bargaining table with their workers and say, listen, if you do not take a cut in