

The second problem, Mr. Speaker, is the President has used the bully pulpit to lull the American people into a false sense of complacency. As I said on this floor many times before, this President 140 times has given speeches all over America, 3 times from this pulpit in the State of the Union Address where he has looked at the camera and said, "You can sleep well tonight because for the first time in 50 years, Russian missiles are no longer pointed at America's children." As the Commander in Chief, he knows he cannot prove that, because Russia will not give us access to their targeting practices. He further knows that if he could prove that, you can retarget an ICBM in 30 seconds. But by saying that over and over again, 140 times on college campuses, in the well of the Congress, around the world, you create the feeling in America that we have nothing to worry about, there are no longer any threats, use of the bully pulpit in an extreme way just as wrong as some of my colleagues wanting to recreate Russia as an evil empire, which I do not believe.

The third reason why we are where we are today with Iran, Mr. Speaker, is because this administration has deliberately politicized and sanitized intelligence data. That is a pretty harsh statement. Can I back that up? Mr. Speaker, I will cite, not today with the lack of time, but I will cite for anyone who wants the information five specific instances where I can prove that this administration has deliberately taken intelligence data that is intent on giving the Congress an understanding of an emerging threat and this administration has either cut off the head of the messenger or has sanitized that information. Most recently last week we saw the announced early resignation and retirement of the director of our CIA Non-Proliferation Center, an outstanding professional who has given his life to allowing this country to understand emerging threats from proliferation activities of countries like North Korea, China, and Russia. Because of pressure that was felt on this individual and his job because of briefings he has given to Members of Congress and where he has given us information about technology transfer about China and Russia giving technology to rogue nations, he was basically put in such a terrible position that he took early retirement rather than face the prospect of having to fight his superiors in the White House and the State Department.

The second example. I heard about a briefing from a Russian expert at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory 2 years ago called Silver Bullets about emerging Russian technology. As the chairman of the House research committee on defense, I asked for that briefing. For 6 months, I was denied the briefing. During the 6 months, I got an anonymous letter in my office which I have kept. The anonymous letter was addressed to me, no return address, no signature. It said, "Congressman

Weldon, please continue to ask for this brief."

Mr. Speaker, we should never have to have the intelligence community anonymously ask us to be briefed on an issue as important as emerging technologies. Another example of this administration choking the information that we need to make intelligence decisions about the threats that are emerging around the world. Mr. Speaker, we need to understand that intelligence is designed to keep us informed on emerging threats.

A third example was the direct removal of Jay Stewart from his position as the person in charge of security for the Department of Energy intelligence operation monitoring Russian nuclear material. That case has been documented. Jay Stewart has been before my committee. Jay Stewart was removed from his position because he was saying things that people in the White House did not want to listen to. This is not America, Mr. Speaker. That is why we are where we are today. That is why Iran has a capability that is going to threaten America, threaten our troops and threaten our allies. I would encourage our colleagues to cosponsor Impact 97 so that we have the protection we need 12 months from now to defeat Iran in its effort to destabilize the entire world community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I thank the staff for bearing with me during this special order.

□ 1530

#### FAST TRACK NEGOTIATING AUTHORITY GOOD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we are not only at the end of the legislative day, but the end of the legislative week, and the three most heard words over the next several hours all across the country will be "trick or treat."

This is Halloween, and, as we think about those words, I would like to talk about an issue which some, unfortunately, believe may be a trick on the people of the United States of America, but in fact it is more than a very, very well-deserved and well-earned treat. I am talking about the issue that we will be voting on most likely 1 week from today, and that is whether or not we should be granting authority to the executive branch to proceed with negotiations in an attempt to open new markets, so that U.S. workers will be able to produce goods and services that can be exported into those new markets.

Yes, it is called fast track, and I happen to believe that it is the right thing for the workers and the consumers of the United States of America and for workers and consumers throughout the world.

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] was just talking about national security issues and the need for a missile defense system. I am a very strong supporter. As I said a few moments ago, I am proud to be I guess the 104th cosponsor of his legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the issue that we are going to be voting on next week is a very important national security issue as well. In fact, in many ways, it may be the most important national security vote that we face.

The reason I say that is that the United States of America, as we all know, is the world's only complete superpower: Military, economically, and geopolitically. As such, we have tremendous responsibility as a nation.

We are clearly the world's greatest exporter. Our Nation is involved in the issue of international trade in a way that is greater than any other nation on the face of the Earth. And what has happened over the past several years? Well, the technological changes that we have seen, many of those items which have been developed right here in the United States of America, have led the world to shrink.

We are dealing with what is known as a global economy. In fact, in an era decades ago when it would take a steamship to get a message across the ocean, we obviously see instantaneous communication. I talk to constituents who now, based on developments just within the last week, are up at 2 o'clock in the morning monitoring the stock exchanges in Singapore, Tokyo, Hong Kong, and other parts of the Pacific rim. Why? Because whether we like it or not, we are living in a global economy today.

I happen to like it, because I believe that this global economy has played a key role in allowing the United States of America to have clearly the highest standard of living on the face of the Earth.

Now, what do we need to do as we look at the need to continue to remain competitive in this global economy? It is very important that we remain in the most potent position. The only way to do that, the only way for us to do that, is if we allow authority to begin negotiations to deal with a lot of these issues to proceed. That is why the Congress must grant this so-called fast track negotiating authority.

It expired a few years ago. We have been trying to come to an agreement, and I am happy to say several weeks ago we did come to an agreement which allowed us to successfully address many of the concerns that have been raised over the past several years.

Why is it that we need this? Well, if you look at the fact that in this global economy the world has access to our consumers, that, frankly, is a very good thing. It is a good thing because it has allowed consumers in the United States of America to purchase high quality products at the lowest possible price.

But now what is it we need to do as we look at other parts of the world and

how we even strengthen our already strong economy? What we need to do is we need to break down barriers that exist in other countries throughout the world.

A number of my colleagues have said to me in discussing this over the past several days, gosh, why don't those countries just unilaterally eliminate their tariff barriers? The fact is, if we look at where we are going on this issue, it does take a negotiating process. It does take a give-and-take. But the goal is to break down those barriers so that U.S. workers are going to be able to have new markets for their goods and services.

So what needs to be done? We need to have the authority granted so that when negotiations start, our negotiators at the table will be in a similar position to the negotiators from other countries. And what does that mean? It means that when they negotiate an agreement to cut taxes, and a tariff is a tax, as they work for those tax cuts, those tariff reductions, they will be able to come back to the United States and say to the Congress, "You can't renegotiate the agreement that we have struck, but you have the final say as to whether or not this is a good agreement."

The U.S. Congress can vote "yes" or "no." If it is a bad agreement, I will be the first one to stand here and vote "no." But if it is a good agreement, I will be leading the charge in favor of it, because a good agreement is one that will cut that tax, that tariff barrier, and create new opportunities for U.S. workers.

So as we look at where we are headed, I think it is important to touch on the benefits of this global economy to us. In fact, everyone acknowledges that we have seen tremendous improvements in our economy. One of the major reasons has been through international trade.

I am privileged to stand in this Chamber as a Representative from the State of California. In California, we are the gateway to the Pacific rim and Latin America, tremendous new emerging markets in both of those parts of the world. And, remember, with those emerging markets, what happens? We improve the living standards in those countries. So many of the issues that we face as problems here can be effectively addressed.

I am referring, of course, to the hotly debated question of illegal immigration, of great concern to me and the people whom I represent in southern California. Many people who come into this country come illegally seeking economic opportunity. Well, if we can through greater international trade enhance the economist of our neighbors and other countries throughout the world, clearly we will create a disincentive for people to come to the United States simply seeking economic opportunity, as has been the case.

In fact, today international trade represents nearly one-third of the gross

domestic product in this country, \$2.1 trillion, an amazing figure from international trade. In fact, 25 percent of all of the U.S. jobs today are related to international trade, and, in fact, they have wage rates that are 16 percent higher than those that are producing simply for domestic consumption.

That is why I am so troubled when I turn on the television and see these advertisements that the AFL-CIO and other opponents to international trade agreements advertise. These advertisements are a clear misrepresentation, because as we gain new and greater markets for U.S. products, just based on the way things have gone, the wage rates for those union members will be 16 percent higher than it is for those members who are simply producing for domestic consumption here in the United States.

We have today the lowest unemployment rate in three decades. It is 4.9 percent. And, guess what? That 4.9 percent level of unemployment has gone down to that level following implementation of, again, the much-maligned North American Free Trade Agreement and the completion of the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. So as we have done that, we have been able to break down some barriers, and we have been able, as I said, to see 25 percent of the jobs in this country exist because of the fact that we have gained new markets.

With this authority, we want to gain even more in new markets, because it will improve the standard of living here and in other parts of the world.

I was mentioning the issue of our leadership role. Clearly the United States of America cannot cede that leadership role to other parts of the world, because we as a country have stood traditionally in a bipartisan way with Democrats and Republicans supporting this goal of breaking down barriers and trying to gain new markets and new opportunities for us.

There are many people who have raised understandable concerns about the climate and the situation in other countries with which we would establish these agreements. People are understandably concerned about low wage rates in other countries. They are understandably concerned about the potential for low environmental standards.

Well, I happen to believe that will, based on the empirical evidence we have seen, improve the standards of living in these countries, improve wage rates, improve environmental standards. Of course, look at our very strong economy. That has played a key role in allowing people to focus attention on making sure that we have a cleaner environment, and has allowed the American worker to focus on improvement of their plight. Getting wage rates up and improvements in their negotiations, in the same way as we proceed with international trade in these other countries, we will, through trade, be able to successfully improve those standards.

One of the provisions in this fast track measure of which I am particularly proud is when it comes to the negotiating process we are not going to allow countries to engage in what is called the race to the bottom. We are not going to allow a country to intentionally lower their environmental standards or worker rights standards simply to distort trade.

An example I use, just take for example if the Government of Chile, which is the country with which we hope to embark on a free trade agreement in the not-too-distant future after we put into place this fast track negotiating authority, if they were to lower their standards and say to the copper mining industry in Chile, for example, that you can dump sledge in the street, and it is being done to undercut the copper mining industry here in the State of Colorado in the United States, that is an issue that could go to a dispute resolution panel and could be addressed.

So we do not allow under this agreement countries to simply reduce their standards as a way to distort trade. But the way to improve those standards, which we are all concerned about, is through greater exchange and greater trade. So I am very, very encouraged about that.

There are many people who have raised concerns about the constitutional aspect of this, and clearly the use of fast track authority is the legislative branch, both the House and the Senate, exercising its rulemaking authority. Every trade bill needs to, as I said, be voted on and passed by a majority in both the House and the Senate and signed into law by the President. So we clearly do have a key role in dealing with these agreements.

So I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this is, I know, a very controversial issue. It has created a great stir, and people over the next week are going to be talking about it. But I believe that it is a win-win-win-win-win situation. It is a win all the way around, because the idea of reducing taxes, reducing tariffs, has been a global desire now. It goes all the way back to 1947 when the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was established. They were established with the goal of reducing tariff barriers. Now we have a great chance to do that.

There are small businesses in California and in other parts of the country. I have been listening to our colleagues from both parties all across the country talking about how small businesses are involved in gaining access to new markets, and they want to be able to do more. They want to be able to do more.

□ 1545

As I listened to the kinds of proposals that have come forward to address some of the concerns, I think that those are positive, too, because I think there are some justifiable concerns.

But, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the vote next week, if we were to make

what I think would be a horrible decision in this House and defeat the measure, we would basically be saying that the United States of America is no longer going to play the role as the world's strongest leader in the area of international trade. So it would be a grave mistake.

This goal we have is a vision which has existed for a long period of time. I will say to my friend, the Speaker here, the Speaker pro tempore, he recalled with me just a little while ago that it was on November 7, 1979 when Ronald Reagan announced his candidacy for President of the United States, and in that he talked about an accord that would see free trade going from the slopes of Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, ultimately seeing free trade among all the Americas.

I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to be in Argentina and Venezuela and Brazil on the trip that the President took. On that trip it was very clear that these countries are looking to the United States for the leadership role in the area of international trade. I am confident that the U.S. Congress will, with a great, great vision, look next Friday when we cast that vote towards doing it.

One of the other things beyond this hemisphere happens to be dealing with some very specific areas that need to be addressed in a multilateral way with many other countries. Those areas include agriculture. We have had a very tough time in agriculture getting into a lot of new markets. Why? Because there are many countries that have had these tariff barriers and nontariff barriers which exist which have prevented the chance for exports to go into those countries.

If we look at the issue of financial services, we all see that there are banks all over the United States with international names. Basically the world's financial services industry has access into the United States. Yet we, unfortunately, have been unable to negotiate agreements that will allow our financial services industry to expand in providing those products and services to consumers in other parts of the world. That is why we need to get this fast track authority through.

One of the other very important items, again to my State and to all the other States, is this very amorphous issue called intellectual property rights. Intellectual property, what does that mean? Well, these are items that are developed through the intellect of people in that home country.

We need to make sure that those rights are protected. In the area of pharmaceuticals, we have many very, very necessary drugs and other items that are created in the pharmaceutical industry. We need to make sure that the responsibility for those lies with those countries where they are developed, and that they get full credit and remuneration for them. That is why international property agreements need to be struck.

I represent the Los Angeles area. The entertainment industry is very, very important to our State. In fact, if we look at the entertainment industry, well over 90 percent of the world's programming for the motion picture industry and the television programming comes from right here in the United States, and we are all aware of the fact that piracy has been a serious problem.

We need to deal with negotiations on that kind of intellectual property violation that has existed. Guess what? We will not be able to deal with the negotiations for financial services, getting our financial institutions into new markets, we will not be able to deal with negotiations for agriculture, to gain new markets for agricultural products, and we will not be able to as successfully deal with intellectual property violations if we do not have fast track negotiating authority passed.

So while there are many people out there who would like to blame all the ailments of society on international trade, nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the Speaker pro tempore and all of our colleagues will next week, when we face what I acknowledge will be a very tough vote here in this institution, that Members will join in supporting what is clearly the right thing to do as we remain the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

July 18, 1997:

H.R. 173. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize donation of Federal law enforcement canines that are no longer needed for official purposes to individuals with experience handling canines in the performance of law enforcement duties.

H.R. 649. An act to amend sections of the Department of Energy Organization Act that are obsolete or inconsistent with other statutes and to repeal a related section of the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974.

July 25, 1997:

H.R. 1901. An act to clarify that the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act apply to the members and personnel of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission.

H.R. 2018. An act to waive temporarily the Medicaid enrollment composition rule for the Better Health Plan of Amherst, New York.

August 1, 1997:

H.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to two specified bills of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

August 5, 1997:

H.R. 709. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1226. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the unauthorized inspection of tax returns or tax return information.

H.R. 2014. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 2015. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

August 11, 1997:

H.R. 584. An act for the relief of John Wesley Davis.

H.R. 1198. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, Oregon.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

August 13, 1997:

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

August 15, 1997:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

September 17, 1997:

H.R. 1866. An act to continue favorable treatment for need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws.

September 30, 1997:

H.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

H.R. 63. An act to designate the reservoir created by Trinity Dam in the Central Valley project, California, as "Trinity Lake".

H.R. 2016. An act making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

October 6, 1997:

H.R. 111. An act to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of unused agricultural land in Dos Palos, California, to the Dos Palos Ag Boosters for use as a farm school.

H.R. 680. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer of surplus personal property to States for donation to nonprofit providers of necessities to impoverished families and individuals, and to authorize the transfer of surplus real property to States, political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States, and nonprofit organizations for providing housing or housing assistance for low-income individuals or families.

H.R. 2248. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contribution toward religious understanding and peace, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2443. An act to designate the Federal building located at 601 Fourth Street, NW., in the District of Columbia, as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington Field Office Memorial Building", in honor of William H. Christian, Jr., Martha Dixon Martinez, Michael J. Miller, Anthony Palmisano, and Edwin R. Woodruffe.

October 7, 1997:

H.R. 2209. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

October 8, 1997:

H.R. 2266. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.