

the conference, to assist the United States in resolving the veterinary equivalency issue with the Europeans. This was appropriate because Singapore recognizes the equivalency of the United States meat inspection system as it transships United States meat to other Asian nations.

We also met with the Canadian delegation. Talks focused on several bilateral issues with our two nations, including the recent NAFTA panel on dairy and poultry and the U.S. sugar program. I also asked the Canadians opinion on two issues: China's accession to the WTO and the dispute on veterinary equivalency between the United States and the EU. The Canadian delegation agreed fully with my position on China. Specifically, they said that WTO members should not lower entry standards for China and that market access and subsidy issue must be addressed before China is admitted.

Regarding the veterinary equivalency issue, the Canadian delegation agreed that sanitary and phytosanitary provisions of trade agreements must be upheld in order to maintain the grassroots support of farmers for free trade agreements.

On Tuesday, the delegation also met with delegations from Taiwan and the European Parliament, and had the opportunity to express our gratitude to the Prime Minister of Singapore for his nation's hospitality.

The Taiwanese expressed their strong desire to join the WTO. Chairman PHIL CRANE, speaking for the delegation, agreed that Taiwan was close to meeting the requirements for joining the WTO. But he urged Taiwan to be patient while the United States worked through some of its problems with China. I cautioned the Taiwanese that further progress must be made on reducing barriers for agricultural products, such as beef, pork, and poultry. The leader of the Taiwan Parliament, Mr. Vincent Slew, responded that he did not "see any problem" with making the necessary agricultural reforms.

The discussions with the European Parliamentary delegation focused on three issues: Bt corn, veterinary equivalency, and allowing China into the WTO. I raised questions about the EU's potentially keeping Bt corn and other genetically modified organisms from their markets. The European delegation argued that their citizens have an intense distrust of the scientific evidence and government policy because of the recent BSE—mad cow disease—crisis in Europe.

They pointed out that 80 percent of their consumers are against bringing Bt corn into their country and they would consider keeping all U.S. corn out in order to protect their consumers. At least, the Europeans argued, they would require separation and labeling of Bt corn. As I stated earlier, this issue has since been resolved and Bt corn grown in the United States has been accepted in the European markets.

The European delegation promised to look into the veterinary equivalency problem and thought we could make progress in certifying United States meat packing plants. On China, I argued that if the Europeans are truly concerned with their farmers, they should insist that China enter the WTO only on commercially meaningful terms. The European delegation agreed, saying that China must meet all requirements, including those on market access, before joining the WTO.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1996

On Wednesday, the delegation received a full briefing from acting USTR Charlene Barshefsky. She discussed the Statement on Agriculture, outstanding bilateral issues with the European Union, and China's desire to enter the WTO. I pointed out that the terms of China's accession will determine whether China becomes our largest export market for agriculture products or our toughest competitor. To emphasize the importance of agriculture to trade agreements, I also noted that one-half of the nongovernmental observers at the ministerial were from the agriculture sector.

The delegation also met with United States Ambassador to Singapore, Mr. Chorba, and Singapore Foreign Minister Jayakumar. I asked Minister Jayakumar to help bring the other Asian nations on board with the Information Technology Agreement. The minister replied that they shared the United States interest in completing the ITA in Singapore and they would do what they can to accomplish that.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1996

On Thursday, the delegation met with United States Assistant Secretary of State Alan Larson to discuss the recent trip of Secretary of State Christopher to China. This meeting was to prepare the delegation, for its meetings in Beijing.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1996

In Beijing, the delegation received a briefing from the United States Embassy on the Chinese economy and trade situation. Later that day we met with Vice Minister Sun Zhenyu, the American Chamber of Commerce, State Planning Commission Vice Chairman Gan Ziyu, and Vice Premier Zhu Ronghi, member of the standing committee. Several issues were discussed including trade relations between the two countries.●

TRIBUTE TO THE NEVADA TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

● Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Nevada Taxpayers Association. On February 25, 1997, the association will celebrate 75 years of service to the citizens of Nevada. It is my honor to salute the organization for its diligent efforts to inform and serve the public on tax policy issues.

The Nevada Taxpayers Association is the only tax policy and analysis organization of its kind in Nevada. The

mission of this preeminent organization is to protect and preserve sensible fiscal policy that is beneficial to Nevada's citizens, and to enhance fiscal policies that impact our State, county, and city governments.

Since 1922, the Nevada Taxpayers Association has represented the interests of the citizens of Nevada, as well as business and industry, to create a fair and equitable revenue system. For the past 75 years, Nevada's past and current Governors have worked cooperatively with the Nevada Taxpayers Association to ensure the best tax structure possible for the State.

This year, the State of Nevada will celebrate Nevada Taxpayers Association Day on February 25. I applaud the Nevada Taxpayers Association for the integral role it has played, and continues to play, in fiscal policy analysis and research in Nevada. On behalf of all taxpayers in Nevada who have benefited from the association's many publications, reports, and analyses, I wholeheartedly thank them for their invaluable service. It is my pleasure to speak on behalf of the Nevada Taxpayers Association, and I commend the organization for its unwavering support of the rights of taxpayers.●

TRIBUTE TO DAN LACROIX ON BEING NAMED 1997 ROCHESTER CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

● Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Dan LaCroix, honorary member of Gonic PTA, on being named the 1997 Rochester "Citizen of the Year" by the Rochester Chamber of Commerce. I commend his outstanding community commitment and congratulate him on this well-deserved honor.

Dan's community involvements are numerous. He participated in the juvenile diversion program, the substance abuse prevention task force, and he is a current member of the red ribbon program. Dan is a coach of the Rochester Youth Soccer Association, vice-president of the Rochester girls softball, and chairperson of the community relations girls softball.

Dan is known to many as always willing to take responsibility, whether to chair a committee, organize fairs, trips, and dances, or to help people in need. Whatever activity he commits to, he always gets the job done.

Dan has dedicated his time, talent and energy to serving the residents of Rochester in an exemplary way. I am proud to honor Dan LaCroix's outstanding community commitment, which is so important to the future and prosperity of Rochester. We are indeed indebted to him for his efforts. Congratulations to Dan for this distinguished recognition. I am honored to represent him in the U.S. Senate.●

CAFE STANDARDS

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to speak once again on the matter of corporate average fuel economy

standards. Recently, a number of colleagues from both sides of the aisle joined with me to introduce Senate bill 286, legislation to freeze CAFE standards at current levels unless changed by Congress.

There are a host of reasons why this legislation should be adopted, Mr. President. Chief among these: CAFE standards should be frozen so that we may put a stop to the highly inappropriate practice of allowing unelected bureaucrats to set far-reaching policies that have significant effects on the safety and economic well-being of the American people. I believe that such responsibility should lie with this legislature, the body entrusted by our Constitution with the duty to determine whether any proposed policy change is in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. President, in today's Washington Times commentary section, Bruce Bartlett, a senior fellow with the National Center for Policy Analysis, outlines several serious problems with increased CAFE standards. Mr. Bartlett's article illustrates clearly the need for Congress to regain control of CAFE standards and I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 24, 1997]

HIDDEN COSTS OF THE CAFE CAPER

(By Bruce Bartlett)

In 1975, at the height of the energy crisis, Congress passed legislation mandating auto manufacturers to meet corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards. Each auto company was expected to ensure that the average fuel efficiency for all its new car sales would be at least 18 mpg by 1978. The standard was raised in steps to 27.5 mpg by 1990, where it remains currently. However, the Clinton administration has signaled a desire to raise the CAFE standard, despite mounting evidence that the whole program has been a failure.

The biggest problem with CAFE is that there is virtually no evidence it has reduced aggregate gasoline consumption. It is true that auto fuel efficiency has risen 70 percent since 1973, from 13.3 mpg on average to 22.56 mpg in 1995. However, as the figure indicates, the higher fuel efficiency has simply encouraged people to drive more. The average number of miles driven per year has risen 24 percent since 1980, from 9,141 miles to 11,329 in 1995. Thus, even though the average use now uses just 502 gallons of gasoline per year, compared to 771 gallons in 1973, total fuel consumption has continued to rise.

Another problem with CAFE is that it has led to a loss of auto jobs in the U.S. The reason is that there are separate CAFE standards for domestic and imported autos. This has encouraged domestic auto companies to increase the percentage of foreign parts used in some of their models in order to reclassify them as foreign-made. For example, in 1989 Ford turned two of its least fuel efficiency cars, the Crown Victoria and the Grand Marquis, into "imported" cars by reducing their domestic content from 90 percent to less than 75 percent. This allowed Ford to increase the average fuel economy of its domestically produced cars, where it was having a problem meeting the new CAFE standard, while lowering the average for its imported models, where it had room to spare.

Finally, there is growing evidence that CAFE has been detrimental to safety. To in-

crease fuel efficiency, auto companies have had to produce smaller, lighter cars that are less safe than larger, heavier cars. And auto companies have often had to heavily discount these smaller models in order to increase their sales and lower their average corporate fuel economy. Thus a 1989 study estimated that CAFE standards would cost 2,200 to 3,900 lives over the next 10 years.

Virtually all economists agree that higher gasoline taxes would do a far better job of reducing gasoline consumption than CAFE—assuming there is any real need to do so. At a minimum, there should be no further increase in CAFE standards. •

TRIBUTE TO COLIN RIZZIO FOR REVEALING A SAT ERROR

• Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Colin Rizzio for his outstanding math expertise, which led him to uncover an error on the SAT exams. His quick insight has gained much national recognition in the last few weeks including an appearance on "Good Morning America" and on the "Today" show. Colin is a 17-year-old senior at Contoocook Valley Regional High School in New Hampshire. He is an above-average student who kept a cool head under testing conditions. Colin discovered an error which had been overlooked by internal and external math specialists while he was taking the SAT last Columbus Day. He took the time to consider different possibilities the math question offered and revealed the error. Thanks to Colin, the test will now be rescored and students' scores will go up nationwide as the flawed math question has been tossed out.

As a former teacher, I am always heartened by stories of students who go the extra mile for educational integrity. Colin is the type of student who asks "What if?" In this case, his inquisitive nature gained him much notoriety.

It is students like Colin that contribute to the future of the Granite State and I am proud to be his Senator. I congratulate Colin on his outstanding achievement and I wish this exemplary student all the best for his future educational endeavors. •

NARCOTICS CERTIFICATION

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss an important decision facing the President this week in the fight against drug trafficking: Whether to certify that Mexico and Colombia have taken sufficient steps in the past year in combating the narcotics trade. The choice is important not merely because it affects our bilateral relations with these countries, but also because it will send a broader signal about our seriousness of purpose in the war on drugs.

Of course, there will be other nations whose performance on counternarcotics will be assessed by the President this week. But when it comes to the narcotics trade, Mexico and Colombia are in a league by themselves—Co-

lombia, as the leading source country for cocaine, and a major source of heroin, and Mexico, as the leading transit country for cocaine, and as a significant source for heroin, methamphetamines, and marijuana. And it is because of their predominance in the narcotics trade that the President's decision becomes a barometer of the U.S. commitment to this effort.

Before discussing my specific views on the Colombian and Mexican cases, however, I want to briefly offer some general observations about the drug certification process.

Just over 10 years ago, in the 1986 omnibus drug bill, the United States began a process of annually certifying the performance of countries which were either a major source of narcotics, or a major transit route for narcotics trafficking. Decertification does not merely carry a stamp of political disapproval. By law, nations decertified are ineligible for most U.S. foreign aid, and the United States is required to vote against loans for such nations in international financial institutions such as the World Bank.

The President has three choices: First, he can certify that a country is fully cooperating with the United States, or is taking adequate steps on its own, to combat the narcotics trade. Second, he can decertify a country—a statement that it has not met that standard. Finally, he can provide a national interest waiver—a statement that the country has not met the standards of the law, but that the U.S. national interest lies in continuing the assistance programs.

Not surprisingly, the nations subject to the scrutiny of the decertification process have not been thrilled with the honor. Indeed, many nations have protested that the United States has no right to challenge their performance on counternarcotics—given that the large demand in this country helps to generate the supply. Other nations perceive the certification process as an effort to shift the blame for our drug problem.

I firmly reject such arguments.

First, while I concede that the demand in the United States for narcotics has contributed to the explosive growth of the drug trade in Latin America in the last two decades, the dramatic increase in the power of the narcotics cartels—particularly in Colombia and Mexico—cannot be blamed upon the United States alone. The nations themselves must bear responsibility for their own neglect—for failing to take effective action against vast criminal enterprises which arose before their eyes.

Of course, the United States must do its part to combat the drug problem. Over the past decade, we have. For example, we have steadily increased both our financial resources and our political commitment to combating the narcotics trade. We now spend \$16 billion annually on our national drug program, as compared to \$4.7 billion a decade ago. We have devised a national